

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XII
NUMBER 6

JUNE, 1904

WHOLE
NUMBER 116

THE TEACHING OF MODERN LANGUAGES IN ENGLAND.

THE teaching of modern language in England at the present time is chiefly remarkable for its infinite variety of types. For the sake of clearness, however, all may distinguish between three main schools or tendencies, which we may call respectively the Right, the Left, and the Center.

The first group, which is by no means homogeneous, is principally composed of the *vieille garde* of teachers who, owing to their bringing up or from lack of sufficient all-around knowledge, continue to teach on the old, orthodox, classical lines. Their recipe consists of plenty of grammar, translation, and composition. The modern language is treated *perinde ac cadaver*, and is parsed, analyzed, and dissected like a dead language. The mode of study is essentially a study of the dead organ, rather than of its living function, of its dynamic powers. Little or no attempt is made at linguistic vivisection. The ear is quite untrained, accent is largely neglected, and in extreme cases foreign words are not even pronounced, but spelt out in class. Conversation is completely at a discount.

The Left, on the other hand, which forms a still less homogeneous body, is composed of the more militant reformers. Great, and occasionally undue, stress is laid on the oral side of the foreign language. The straitest sect among the "New Methodists" does not allow a word of the mother-tongue to be heard in the class-room. The first lessons are purely *viva voce*.

In some cases there is no writing, not even in phonetic script. Ordinary texts are naturally barred. The teacher is the *fons et origo* of everything, the creator or conjuror who gradually by means of pictures and dumb-crambo produces the language, so to say, out of nothing. Phonetics are generally *de rigueur*. *Lauttafeln* are much in evidence, and when a text is introduced, it is generally printed in the phonetic script. The written work is not infrequently insufficient, and the lack of methodicalness is not unknown.

Between these two extreme wings come the main body of teachers whom we have styled the Center, represented by persons at every possible intermediate stage between the Right and Left, but united by the more or less conscious aim of desiring to arrive at a compromise between the two extremes. Sometimes the "cross" produced is excellent; in other cases it is a sort of mongrel which partakes of the defects of both. The principal points which distinguish the members of this group are the insistence laid on the reading-book as the center and source of instruction, and the attempt to practice the ear and tongue without neglecting the claims of grammar.

Let us look a little closer at the main tenets of the Right and Left. When we have discussed what their ideas are, we shall not only be in a position to gauge the views of the Center, but we may also possibly be able to some extent to postulate what seems the best way of teaching modern languages.

We will begin with the Right. What are their aims, and how do they hope to attain them? Probably they would state that their aim was threefold—namely, to give a mental discipline of the best possible kind, to teach the modern language in a scholarly fashion, and, in the third place, to utilize the modern language as a means of teaching the mother-tongue. They would insist that the grammar drill, the parsing, the picking to pieces of the texture of a foreign language and the reproduction of it in literal English, the analysis of construction, the practice of reconstructing these constructions, when turning English idioms into their foreign equivalences, provide the very finest training for the logical faculties. They would further argue

that these analytic processes furnish an unrivaled training in clearness and accuracy. More especially would they assert that translation was an admirable means of teaching the mother-tongue. And finally they would contend that the close study of the structure of the foreign language would alone make a man a scholar in the true literary sense of the word; in short, that a grammatical and critical study of the text was an indispensable aid to an appreciation of literature. They would ridicule the Left wing as a mere school of "patter and chatter," only fit to turn out foreign bagmen, interpreters, and waiters, and in their contempt for modern literature surfeit their pupils with Corneille and Racine.

Let us now take the Left wing. Their aim is more especially to teach the language so that the pupil may be able to understand, pronounce, speak, and even write it. They take little heed of the logical training of the faculties. They pour scorn on the excessive grammatical analysis of the Right, and insist on the larger rôle played by imitation in the learning of languages, especially in the case of young children. They emphasize the education of the ear; they point out the value of pictures and gestures as valuable adjuncts to the cultivation of the visual and the muscular memory. So far from believing that the foreign language is the best way of teaching the mother-tongue, they deliberately keep the two as distinct as possible. They argue that neither translation nor composition can adequately teach either language. They argue as follows: The pupil who turns English into French may become in some ways a master of the language, but he never arrives at the state at which the two languages are divorced from one another in his mind. He always sees the French through an English medium; like black care, the English is ever behind the French in his mind. In a word, he never learns to think in the language. The minority who lay stress on written work further point out that such a pupil never learns to think in an orderly fashion in the foreign tongue, which is the real meaning of the word "composition." The consequence is that, even when the pupil writes a letter in the foreign language, the English idioms involuntarily occur to him, with the result

is that his letter is a more or less pidgin version of the foreign idiom. In the case of the mother-tongue, he never learns to compose in it either. The foreign idiom always overshadows even the best translation. The most flexible translation is only the happiest of imitations. Even when the pupil forges for himself a good style, as far as phrasing is concerned, he can never learn from mere translation the far more difficult art of putting his phrases into paragraphs and his paragraphs into one harmonious whole. He never learns to compose in the true sense of the word. A vast deal of the weakness in English essay-writing comes from a neglect of the practice of free composition, in which the pupil has to arrange and combine his ideas. The Left wing does not thereby rule out the teaching of the mother-tongue. On the contrary, they insist on its being taught directly and not incidentally. They hold that a mastery of the mother-tongue must facilitate the mastery of a foreign language. If somewhat negligent of the literature, they maintain that the study of the language must embrace as rich a knowledge as practicable of the history, geography, and especially of the social condition of the people. Their motto is based on the theory, "What do they know of France who only French know?" Anything that crops up incidentally in the daily lesson should be illustrated by the teacher with explanations out of his own experiences, or by pictures, or even objects such as coins, newspapers, and actual products of the country. This study of *Realien* is often fortified by that of a conversation book dealing with the experiences of everyday life.

One must always be grateful to those who are pioneers in teaching as in everything else. We are deeply indebted to the reformers, not merely for the happy innovations and improvements they have introduced, but also for the unsuccessful experiments they have made, and even for the excesses they have committed, because in the latter case they put us on our guard as to what to avoid. On the other hand, we have reason to be thankful to the old-fashioned teachers for having held fast to certain truths that the new-methodists have been prone to ignore or overlook. The Center therefore appears to be in the right in

attempting to combine what is best in the two methods. Nevertheless, the question remains in what proportion they should be combined. The exact point, as we shall attempt to show seems to lie more in the direction of the Left than in that of the Right, at what, in fact, we may call the Left Center. This does not in any way imply that there is any hard and fast best method. The best method is not infrequently the method that the teacher, owing to his ability and idiosyncrasy, can carry out best. This is particularly true of the exceptional teacher with his moral earnestness, his enthusiasm, his power of discerning a way when the way, as far as we can see it, looks difficult, and his power to lead his flock along it or over it, and to stimulate them thereby to unusual exertion. No way can be condemned on the score of difficulty, if the flock can surmount it. Rather, the very difficulty develops in them stronger virtues than our more equable gradients can produce. The truth is, all these incommensurable qualities render it impossible for us to work out a universal solution of how the subject should be taught for all and sundry. None the less, thanks to the law of average, it is possible to indicate for the ordinary teacher certain methods and practices which it seems desirable to observe in order to insure the success of his own teaching and of the teaching of the subject throughout the school. When there are one or more teachers, there must be harmony of method. This does not mean uniformity; a sixth form cannot be taught in the same fashion as a first form. But the foundation lessons in the lowest class should be laid with a view to carrying and supporting the top story in the highest. Too often, for lack of symmetry in the methods adopted, a boy receives an education which at every stage reveals a diversity of architecture owing to the variety of teaching methods in vogue in the different forms.

With this standardization of methods in view, we will now attempt to define the position of the Left Center and its respective indebtedness to the Right and Left. It holds that the Left are undoubtedly right in their insistence on the spoken word. The younger the children, the more oral the teaching should be. In fact, in the case of children under nine what with pictures and

pantomime one can largely dispense with a text-book, and the whole lesson can be turned into a sort of informal *causerie*, provided the pupils are allowed to take an active hand in the game in the way of simple or concerted action, such as opening and shutting desks, rising or sitting down, coming up to the teacher's desk, etc. Under cover of these movements the various persons of the simple tenses of the verbs can be practiced. Variety may be further added by the introduction of songs, dialogues, and games for one or more persons, in which scope is given for simple elocution and gesture. A judicious amount of phonetic drill can be sandwiched in right from the start. It is not difficult to gain the children's interest by showing them how the sounds are made, but the drill should be laid aside, as soon as the children show signs of weariness, in favor of something more exhilarating. In pronunciation not only should a proper accent, but clear articulation, be insisted on from the very beginning. It is a common occurrence in English schools to find children with a fairly correct accent speaking under their breath, or failing to open their mouths sufficiently. There is no harm beginning modern languages thus early with young children, provided the teaching is largely informal, which, of course, does not imply that it should be formless. In fact, the teacher must think out very carefully what is to be aimed at, and how it can be produced, the main object being to teach the children to understand and speak the language and take a delight in it. The word "teacher" is used indifferently, throughout the present article, for a male or female teacher; but with these small children, whether boys or girls, the best kind of teacher is undoubtedly a woman. There is one other *caveat* to enter against the early initiation into a foreign tongue, and that is that the hours devoted to such lessons must not encroach on the time which ought to be devoted to the mother-tongue. The Left are quite right in their insistence of a thorough study of the mother-tongue. One may take it as a postulate of sound teaching—though the Right will probably bitterly contest it—that the study of the mother-tongue should always be in advance of that of any other language.

With pupils of nine and upwards the teaching may be made more formal. The pupils have already learned the arts of reading and writing. The phonetic script may be used and phonetic drill taught by means of *Lauttafel*n. The consensus of opinion seems to be that, if dropped after a year or six months, it does not render the acquisition of the ordinary spelling any harder, especially if pupils are not allowed to write it. Songs and dialogues have also here their place. But the introduction of a suitable reading-book, composed not of disconnected sentences, but of short stories, should be made as early as possible. Great stress should be laid on class reading which should be practiced separately and in chorus. Grammar, too, which is at times neglected by the new-methodists, should be largely taught inductively, being quarried out of the pages of the reader as the pupil goes along. There is probably little harm in learning the bare element of accidence by heart, though this drudgery may be lightened and rendered easier by the forms being given to be learned in the guise of sentences, such as "J'aime mon père," "Tu aimes ton père," etc.—a practice which is also a help to conversation. Syntax, on the other hand, should be mainly a matter of induction. While the rules should be made as far as possible a subject of discovery for the pupils, the teacher will bear in mind that all teaching is a match against time and when there is a danger of time being wasted, he will not hesitate to cut the Gordian knot and tell them to rule outright. Above all, from time to time the grammatical data thus collected should be synthesized and catalogued in the pupil's mind by means of revision out of a simple grammar. Thereby a double advantage is secured: the logical instincts are developed, and the pupil's scattered and diffuse knowledge is reduced to a portable and handy shape. The revolt of some of the extreme reformers against the classical dry-as-dust methods has carried them too far. What should we think of a library in which there were as many catalogues as there were authors, but no catalogue had been made of the library as a whole. Is it not enough to acquire knowledge; one must learn to pack it, store it, and render it ready for reference. Simple class directions should be given in

French, but the teacher must make sure that they are proper idiomatic French, not bald translations of English phrases. The teacher's whole attitude toward the mother-tongue is to make as sparing a use of it as he can, but it will not be "tabu." He will, in fact, regard it as a temporary scaffolding, to be taken down as soon as possible. It is probable that those who rigorously exclude the mother-tongue from the class-room, by no means exclude it from the pupil's mind. The picture of a *cheval* when shown to a beginner calls up the word "horse" in his mind, even if it is never mentioned in class. No doubt, in a good many cases the picture helps us to dispense with the mother-tongue, but when there is obviously a difficulty on the part of the class to understand the meaning of any term, and especially of an abstract term, it is far preferable for the teacher to say outright what it means, adding that, when it turns up again, the pupils will have to make it out by means of the French explanations. Much time will thereby be saved. The form will not be in danger of becoming listless from the fact that some have already understood, and the teacher will not be compelled to go the pace of the dullest pupil in the class, thanks to these occasional short-cuts. Again, English must be used at times by way of verification, at least in a large class, to find out if some pupil has really understood. And in the earlier stages of grammar, it is probably wiser to explain difficulties in English, at the same time giving the French equivalents for the rules, in order to prepare for the ultimate teaching of the grammar in the foreign tongue. One cannot too strongly insist on the absolute need of the class being kept together, and this can be expected only by assuring ourselves that the pupils have got clear ideas of the words they are using. Vagueness is fatal to linguistic training. It destroys all the value of the logical discipline. Moreover, when so large a portion of the lesson is conducted in the medium of the foreign language, a failure to appreciate a single expression, is nearly certain to bring about a failure to understand a new phrase in which it is employed as a stepping-stone to further knowledge, and so the *lacunae* in a backward pupil's mind tend to grow in geometrical proportion. Again, if the foreign language is too

exclusively used, it is far from easy to control the *fainéants*, the shirkers and malingerers. If they profess ignorance of something they should have already mastered, it is difficult to bring home to them that the fault is theirs. It is equally different to draw the line between culpable laziness and constitutional sluggishness to take in new data. In this way those who push the direct method to excess are apt to peptonize unduly their teaching, in order to make certain as far as they can, that the weaker vessels of the class are taking in what is said. There is thus a distinct danger that the clever pupils are not sufficiently drawn out or are even tempted to perform below their real merits.

More serious, from an English point of view, is the relaxation of the teacher's power to compel the pupils to tackle difficult, and even to them distasteful, problems, though undoubtedly this disciplinary loss is counterbalanced to a certain extent by the increased attractiveness the teacher is obliged to put into his work. Another gain which should be noted is that the teacher is so obliged to keep the attention of the form going that he has literally not the time to record and keep going the elaborate apparatus of marks so dear to many masters. This is more of an advantage than a disadvantage, for while marks in moderation are an undoubted help by way of stimulus in lower forms, this cult has been pushed to excess in English schools, where they have tended to become an undue burden to masters, and possess the additional defect of displacing the true ideals of learning and adding to the wide-spread "pot-hunting," spirit which is exemplified by the race for prizes and scholarships which has been quite overdone in England.

The written work at the outset should be light, consisting mainly of writing out grammatical forms, or of simple answers to questions dictated in class or written on the blackboard. All written work should be rigidly controlled. Some of the new-methodists profess indifference about the accuracy of written work. A mistake once made on paper is quite as difficult to eradicate as a mistake in accent or oral grammar. A certain amount of verse should be learned by heart. There is no surer help to the rhythm of the language; it is almost indispensable

in teaching voice modulation, stress, and *liaison*. It is a good subject for home work, as is also reading aloud, which is rarely given in English schools. If dictation is given at this stage, it should only consist of a passage which the pupils have already seen.

So far the teaching in these classes for beginners shows a "Left" tendency. But when we come to the vexed question of reading or translation, we at once come to a point on which expert opinion is deeply divided. Some would do translation from the start; the others would practice reading without translation for the first year or two. There is much to be said for both parties. Those who use the reader without translation insist that the entire avoidance of translation enormously strengthens the *Sprachgefühl*. The other side admits this to a certain degree, but believes, owing to the far larger amount of ground they are able to cover, the net gain is the same, or even greater, especially as they believe that conversation can be more quickly learned in this fashion. They further argue that, owing to the greater pace at which the work is taken, there is less chance of boring the brighter pupils, while at the same time they have greater scope for displaying their abilities. Certainly translation allows the pupils to read more bright and idiomatic books from the start—a matter of some importance in French, as anyone acquainted with the delightful children's books in that language will readily agree. Pupils brought up on more direct methods apparently require such simplified texts that all the *malice* and *espièglerie* of the language get evaporated off. Probably the best books for translation are those which give illustrations of unusual words in the texts, after the fashion of an illustrated dictionary, with footnotes of others, explaining in easier French their precise meaning, such as *tintamarre*=*grand bruit et désordre*. In this way most of the historical, literary, and other allusions can be explained to the scholar without the intervention of the mother-tongue. As for the subject-matter, it should undoubtedly deal with some phase or phases of modern French life. Whether the book be used for reading only or translation, the greatest attention should be paid to the reading

aloud, which is often very perfunctorily done in some schools. Above all, pupils should be encouraged to read with proper emphasis and spirit. When conversation is taught, as it should be, mainly from the reading-book, the following method may be followed with advantage: The teacher should begin by asking questions, the answers to which can be practically read directly from the book. If the class are quite beginners, to prevent any waste of time by beating about the bush, the teacher should make one of the class translate his question. The answer in French should at once be demanded. If the pupil cannot give this off-hand, let him give his answer, or the first word of it, in English. The number of question forms are so limited, and the pupils accustom themselves so speedily to this kind of cross-examinations, that the method of translating questions or answers can be easily dropped after two or three lessons, and the conversation henceforth will practically be in French. The complete sentence should always be insisted on by way of answers, at any rate at the beginning. No slovenly reply should be accepted. Mistakes should at once be noticed and submitted to the class for correction. The pupils should work at first with their books open, but should be encouraged to answer as far as possible without looking at them. They will soon learn to answer with them shut. It cannot be too strongly impressed on the teacher that questions at least at first should be based *on*, and not *about*, the subject-matter. Supposing there was a sentence which began, "Une veuve qui avait deux enfants," a typically right question would be, "Combien d'enfants avait la veuve?" a typically wrong one, "Qu'est ce que c'est qu'une veuve?" From such simple and easy sentences, to which the answers can be read from the book with little or no alteration, the teacher can pass to more general questions, beginning with those whose answers summarize the contents of a sentence of two or three lines, till he arrives at such as summarize the contents of a paragraph. The advantages of the method are many. Questions can be graduated to any degree of difficulty. With no other system can the teacher ask so many in so short a time. The pupil soon discovers that the method provides the least irksome means of

enlarging his vocabulary. Having read and translated the passage, he has the words already floating in his mind; the method of oral repetition helps to fix them definitely. It is likewise a valuable aid to composition, whether free or other; in fact, it is indispensable. The mere fact that the whole conversation, question and answer alike, is based on the reading-book, safeguards both master and pupil against falling into a phraseology which is barely French at all.

All these advantages are common, to a certain extent, to the system of reading without translation. Where, however, those who practice translation score, is in the far greater speed at which they can teach their pupils vocabulary. While the direct-methodist is ringing the change on some ten phrases which the class has more or less imperfectly mastered, the other teacher could ask in the same time some fifty questions from the reading-book. Now, this question of the acquisition of vocabulary is one of capital importance. It ranks equally with grammar and pronunciation. No one can be said to have mastered a language who has not mastered all three. The direct-methodist, by being obliged to harp on a few phases at the beginning in order to impress them on the pupil's mind, certainly runs a risk of unduly retarding the acquisition of vocabulary. Besides, there are, as a matter of fact, two sorts of vocabulary to acquire—one consisting of words which one uses in conversation, the other of words which one sees in print, but rarely, if ever, employs. The direct-methodist, with his penchant for making his pupils learn by heart every word they come across, defers to perhaps too late a date the acquisition of the vocabulary of unusual words, which is far the greater of the two.

After two or three years, if not sooner, it is extremely desirable that the reader should be definitely exchanged for some modern author, which would remain the center of instruction. Some persons at this stage would have two texts—one to be studied slowly and thoroughly for translation, grammar, and composition; the other, to be read aloud rapidly in order to give the pupils a real taste of the language. Such a system would combine the advantages of the two methods described above. Meanwhile the com-

position, which in its earlier stages consisted of the copying out of grammar forms, the ascertaining of simple questions based on the text in French or the turning into French of simple English sentences more or less of the nature of retranslation, should have grown and expanded into free composition in the text, largely aided by the conversational method given above, and of retranslation on a still larger scale. If original composition is attempted, it should be but seldom, and should take the form of a letter on some subject which has been thoroughly talked over by the teacher and the class together. Otherwise the pupils will begin to cut their canine teeth in French—a process which is always to be avoided, if possible. The only allowable exception, on account of its advantages in encouraging personal initiative, is participation in international correspondence. If the teacher is energetic, he can easily find foreign correspondents for the whole of his form, as there are always a majority of would-be writers unpaired on the other side of the channel. Later on, the same pupils who are going in business at sixteen might begin commercial French.

So far we have assumed that French is and should be the first language to be studied. As far as numbers go, French is studied in England in comparison with German in the proportion of at least five to one. In Wales it is still greater (5,506 French papers to 42 German in the last Central Welsh Royal Examinations). Some people are asking at the present time whether we should not rather begin with German. Those who favor German urge, that, owing to its accent, intonation, spelling, which is largely phonetic, and greater kinship to English, as far as common everyday words are concerned, it is an easier language for beginners than French. In intonation, accent, and spelling it is undoubtedly easier, though the question of accent for young children with its inflexible voice-organs is not so formidable as for those who are older. The advantages in word-relationship largely depend on the age of the learner and the vocabulary he has already acquired. The English boy of nine or ten who has already learned to read probably finds as many related words in French as in German. On the other hand, German, with its more abundant inflections, its numerous inversions, and its complicated word-order, is far

harder for the pupil who goes any distance into the language. One writer claims that we have most to learn from Germany "in the regions of science, philosophy, theology, in matters educational, commercial, and military." This is rather a large order. German is certainly necessary, or rather desirable, for those who engage in research in any of these subjects, but the output of France in original investigation is by no means to be despised, and what the French have contributed on these subjects has at least the merit of intelligibility. Besides, the great majority of these subjects lie entirely outside the school curriculum, and such knowledge as is required for reading an author on a technical subject can be easily got at later. The difficulty for the adult is not so much a difficulty of grammar as of the technical vocabulary to be acquired, which in any case cannot be acquired at school. Again, if philosophy is to be taught as a school subject—and there is much to be said in its favor—we must look to France and not to Germany. In France it has been long one of the best-taught subjects in school, whereas it is practically unknown in German schools, and the lack not only of philosophy, but of philosophical treatment of subjects in the higher classes, is recognized as a burning question even by the authorities themselves. If commercial reasons are to enter into consideration, the balance of advantages is on the side of France, for whereas our trade with the two countries and their dependencies is about equal, the ignorance of English which exists in France in comparison with Germany renders it far more important for our young traders to learn French. Supposing, however, that the *pro's* so far are on the side of German, there are two reasons which should make us decide in favor of French. One is that, as a preparatory study to Latin, German, in spite of its inflections and word-order, cannot compare with French, which is the direct descendant of the Latin language. The other reason is that, as a descendant of not only Latin but Greek culture, French with its unrivaled lucidity offers a far greater field for literary training and culture, supplying us with just that practice in clear and logical thought, and in the art of clear and concise expression, which we as a nation lack. A mechanical

imitation of the laborious industry of the Germans would be a poor substitute for what French offers us. If, as the case often occurs, pupils have time to study only one modern language, one cannot help feeling that the language with which pupils start should be French.

But our assumptions do not end here. As things are at present in England, Latin is in many schools often commenced simultaneously with French, with the result that the latter is never treated at any stage with the seriousness it deserves. Certain reforms are urgently necessary in this matter. We should, in fact, copy the so-called Frankfort method, which has recently been introduced on a large scale into the curricula of the lycées in France. The mother-tongue must be made of greater importance at the outset; foreign languages should be introduced into the curriculum one at a time; the study of such languages should be intensive, in order that a fine grasp should be obtained of one before the second is started, and so on; the order of language study should be French, and then Latin, and perhaps Greek, or French and then German. The Frankfort experiment has now been carried on sufficiently long to prove that the pupils who begin classics later, thanks to the intensive method of study and to their greater maturity of mind, are in no wise inferior to the others taught on the old plan. The great advantage, however, of the Frankfort system is that it enables parents to postpone till the age of twelve their choice of a classical or modern education for their boys whereas under the old system the decision must be made when the latter is only nine. One can only add that in the smaller English secondary schools these highly desirable reforms can be only rendered possible by a reduction of the present excessive hours given to science teaching.

But there is yet another lion in the path to a proper development of a well-thought out curriculum in modern languages, combining the advantages of the new with the old. The obstacle in question is the existence of a series of external examinations which practically dictate that the teaching shall be for all boys between the ages of fourteen and nineteen (and even younger). These examinations, though much improved of recent years, are

still conducted on mainly classical lines; in only a few cases have oral examinations been tentatively introduced. It would take us too long here to describe how in the near future they may be either transformed or diminished by the substitution of inspection.

Assuming the accomplishment of such reforms, what should be the ideals of modern language teaching in the higher forms? The answer to such a question must naturally vary with the nature of the school. In a classical school probably only one modern language can be taken up, and, with the introduction of first Latin and then Greek, it is manifest that the French cannot be developed beyond a good working knowledge of the language. In a school where Latin alone is studied, a further extension can be given to French, but it is only in the purely modern school, where it has to bear, either alone or with German, the full burden of linguistic training, that its teaching can be worked out in detail. Space permits us to consider only this particular case. As for the second language, let it suffice to say that, as it is begun at a later age (say twelve or thirteen), the teacher will be able to take the pupils along at a faster rate than in the case of the first language, and that, though the second language may not be studied in such detail, yet the methods followed will be largely the same in both cases. The reading-book, as before, should be the center of instruction, but, as the pupils proceed the bias given to the teaching should be more and more literary in the true sense of the word. Thus with pupils of sixteen and upwards, Racine and Corneille, so out of place in the lower classes, should now be studied, rather than second-rate modern novels. Such pupils should be able to appreciate the fine literary flavor of these classic authors, having by this time become possessed of a standard of comparison, through their acquisition of the modern idiom. The reading of selections and snippets should be reduced to a minimum. Authors should be read in large quantities, or in works complete in themselves, such as poems and plays. The teaching should, as far as possible, be conducted in the foreign medium. Grammar should not be pushed to excess, nor its modern supplanter, philology, though

a little handbook on historical grammar would not be out of place. But the instruction should be above all literary and critical. It should include discussions on the subject-matter of, say, the play the class was studying, with an analysis of the plot, of the principal characters, and of the stage-craft displayed by the writer, dealing with such questions as why such and such a person or incident is introduced. These matters might also be utilized as materials for original compositions. That parasite of modern education, the annotated edition, should be, as far as possible, dispensed with. Instead of studying a poem or play as an artistic and literary whole, the pupil has his attention perpetually called off and distracted by some footnote of fifth rate importance, while his taste and judgment are formed in advance for him by the critical appreciation prefixed to the text. What external information is required should be supplied by the teacher, or be hunted up by the pupils themselves in the reference library of the school. Alongside of the comparatively careful study of some classical masterpiece, the pupils should employ for rapid reading a play by the same writer, or by one of the same, or even a later, epoch, which would afford scope and subject-matter for comparison and contrast. As the writings of some great French critic on the author in question might be simultaneously studied, at the same time, certain modern standard authors could be recommended to them for home reading. In the highest class some introduction might be made to the study of philosophy by the reading in class of Descartes's *Discours de la méthode*, or some of Pascal's works. The subject of commercial French and German is too big to be treated here, but in the case of boys who desired to specialize in commercial French and German, without going to a technical school, they should be drafted into a special class in which they might spend their last year.

But such an ideal curriculum presupposes proper class-rooms and suitable teachers. We in England have been slow to appreciate the educational value and influence of the *milieu*. Our pupils cannot go to the foreign country, but we can to a certain extent bring the foreign country to them. Just as the French

embassy in London is technically and legally French territory, so the French class-room in an ordinary school should be, as far as possible, an *enclave* of France in the middle of England. It should be decorated as much as possible *à la Française*; the pictures, photos, and maps should be French; the notices should be in French, and the "service," as we have seen, should, as far as practicable, be conducted in French. Pupils should have the same feeling of a change of atmosphere on entering it as they have on entering a church. The best classical class-rooms, however well-fitted up, can be only a *chapelle ardente* of departed glories; but the ideal French class-room should be a real-like bit of France, reproducing all that is best about it, just as a well-furnished conservatory is a replica of the best growth of foreign climes.

So much then for the shrine, and now for the *officiant*. We are met at the outset by the question whether he should be English or foreign. Continental expert opinion is practically unanimous in favor of the home-bred teacher in preference to the foreigner. The latter no doubt, when well educated, must possess his own language in a way to which those who have at a great price attained proficiency in the French or German cannot pretend. But the problem of teaching does not end with the attainments of the taught, and in power to communicate his knowledge the home-bred teacher possesses two tremendous advantages; he knows what are the difficulties of his own countrymen, and he also knows what is still more important, the idiosyncrasy of the British schoolboy. Hence he is able to foresee difficulties and overcome them methodically, and at the same time teach with a minimum of friction. Even in the matter of accent judicious teaching on phonetic lines will enable us to produce far better results than the sporadic efforts of the foreigner. Still in the larger schools there is undoubtedly a place for the foreign teacher to act as a sort of court of appeal on knotty points, to teach and correct the free composition in the higher forms, to take the pupils in conversation and in reading (where no translation is involved). We are about to start an interchange of teachers with Germany and France in the near

future, and for such work as has just been described, these "hostages of friendship" we are about to receive should prove invaluable.

But if we are to have "home-bred" teachers for preference, they must be thoroughly efficient. They must be something more than masters of mediæval French and German. They must be acquainted, not only with modern French, but also with modern France. In addition to a university course they should have spent at least a year in the country. It would probably make matters easier if this year were allowed to count in the number of years necessary for an English university degree, provided that the student were affiliated to a foreign university. Germany so far has done but little in the matter. But in France the International Guild, whose examinations are under the control of the university, and which is likely to be still more closely attached to it in the near future, provides exactly the training in phonetics, modern French, and modern literature that the would-be teacher desiderates. This excellent institution has been recognized by the Board of Education as a suitable place for primary teachers to study in their third year, and it has also been recognized by the University of Chicago; time spent in attending lectures at the guild count in the period necessary for a degree. What we want in England is for the central and local authorities to copy on a large scale the example of their *confrères* abroad in founding a large number of traveling scholarships, and in paying the expenses of those teachers who wish to attend holiday courses in France and Germany. The latter practice already obtains to a certain degree. Holiday courses, as far as they go, are of the greatest value, not only in helping to improve the knowledge of the weaker teacher, but in refreshing that of the better-trained teachers. When the best French-born teachers in England recognize the necessity of periodic visits to France, it is needless to dwell on the importance of such visits for English teachers.

To sum up: The above course, as we have seen, attempts to combine the best features of the old and new methods. It insists at the outset on the importance of the spoken word, with

special reference to correctness of accent and clearness of articulation. To this purpose it makes a large use of phonetic drill and the practice of recitation in prose and verse. It avoids making a fetish of mere fluency. It does not neglect grammar, while carefully guarding against its excessive abuse. It does not discard translation, though not always certain of the point at which it should be taken up. It makes, in fact, the reading-book the center of instruction, largely bases conversational practice on it, and insists on the extreme value of the latter as an aid to oral composition. It treats the language throughout as a living thing, and loses no opportunity to instil into the pupil a knowledge of the country and its social conditions, working in at the same time a certain amount of geographical and historical data.

In the higher classes it diverges into neither minute scholarship nor philology, but holds fast to the main idea of giving a sound linguistic, literary, and critical training with an initiation into the elements of philosophy at the top of the school. It avoids throughout the whole course the excessive abuse of annotated editions, making the study of the actual text the base and center of instruction. Without vigorously excluding the mother-tongue, it keeps it, as far as it can, in the background, allowing, however, in the higher classes, a reference to English literature for purposes of comparison.

It thus forms within the individual a separate yet dependent spirit, subordinate to the national one which gives him, as it were, a new window on the world, and realizes the truth of Charles V.'s profound saying that "Mit jeder neuen Sprache gewinnt man eine neue Seele." Such a reduplication of the personality, which yet remains a unity at base, is one of the greatest aids to the formation of a sound judgment, which Montaigne regarded as the most precious product of education. Thanks to this two-mindedness, he who is a *doctus sermone utriusque linguae* possesses a power of comparison which it is difficult for a fellow-countryman of the same caliber as himself to attain. Comparing what is regarded as truth on one side of the Channel with what is looked on as error on the other, he sees more clearly than

others the exact proportion of verity contained in the two conceptions, and, in respect to changes and innovations, is far more likely to keep an open mind than one who swears by everything national. "In fact, his mind, from having passed its time, now in a French *milieu* and again in an English environment, must in the course of its travels have shed not a few prejudices and acquired no little wisdom; so that the learning of a foreign language may perhaps in its deepest sense be not inaptly regarded as a veritable transmigration of the soul."

CLOUDESLEY BRERETON.

NORFOLK, ENGLAND.

FRENCH AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR LATIN.

BEHIND the endless discussion of courses, text-books, and methods lurks the fundamental problem, too often overlooked by zealous disputants: What is the proper place of our study in the system of education; in what way is it to benefit the pupil? The general question applies to German—or, in fact, to any other topic—as well as to French, but the answer differs more or less according to the nature of the subject.

In our case the reply to the inquiry is by no means obvious. We may dismiss at once the familiar utilitarian response; and we may do so without engaging in the far-reaching debate as to whether our secondary schools should afford apprenticeship in the arts and crafts. French is no more "practical" than Greek. Even under the most favorable conditions, the linguistic attainments of ordinary scholars are absolutely worthless from the commercial standpoint. And were they much higher than they are, what would be the native youth's chance of success in competition with the hosts of bilingual hyphenated Americans? The plea that the possession of a strange tongue is essential to the enjoyment of travel, or that it is often convenient for intercourse with foreigners at home, is too frivolous to merit consideration. On such grounds a better case could be made for dancing as a high-school study: nearly all pupils are likely to have opportunities to dance, but not one in fifty will see Europe or be called upon to entertain a European. If we wish to be taken seriously, we must point to real advantages; and if we can find none, let us at least save our self-respect by withdrawing from the contest. The inferior position occupied by French in the educational world is due to its constant association with trivialities.

For some two thousand years the world's greatest minds have been formed by the discipline of Latin. All through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and in modern times almost down to our own recollection, Latin grammar was the one instrument of

mental training, Latin literature the chief æsthetic stimulant. When we look back over the centuries and consider all the mighty intelligences that fed upon this sturdy diet, we begin to waver in our acceptance of latter-day substitutes, and to demand that the pedagogical Grape Nuts and Sunny Jims show us something more convincing than advertisements. Nothing, however, is more evident than that the good old meat is little by little to be discontinued. The marvelous expansion of knowledge, the transformation of life and thought, have already relegated Greek so far to the background that the word "Attic," to the new generation, suggests only the musty, unexplored recesses of the storeroom. And however bitterly we regret it, no matter how fiercely our heroic broom oppose the rising tide, we are destined—as far as human foresight can discern—to see Latin slowly dislodged to make room for new and untried idols.

Let us look to it that the new gods be not too inferior to the old. That they shall at once be equal is not to be expected; we must resign ourselves, for some time to come, to the prospect of youth inadequately trained. The three leading aspirants to Latin's ferule are mathematics, natural science, and modern languages. The first member of this pantheon is not altogether a stranger. Mathematics is a time-honored hand-maid to the classics, and in this capacity has done good service, inculcating accuracy and concentration. More than this it cannot do. Its narrowness, its remoteness from human interest, unfit it for a leading part. The best conceivable mathematician (we are discussing, of course, only the elementary branches) is a machine; and a study whose highest object is mechanical perfection, while most useful as an ancillary discipline, is dehumanizing if permitted to usurp the central place. The most we can wish for mathematics is that it keep its traditional honorable position.

What are the claims of natural science? It trains the eye, the hand; it makes us familiar with natural forces and the lower forms of life; it brings us into close communion with the macrocosm that surrounds us; in other words, it develops those powers and instincts that are characteristic of the savage. Now, it may be that mankind has grown too bookish, too introspective;

that a partial reversion to barbarism is not untimely. So much one may willingly admit. But a return to savagery can hardly constitute the whole onward march of civilization. The pursuit of natural science, however interesting and wholesome it may be, can never to the slightest degree replace the humanities. With the incursion of "scientific" subjects into the curriculum, the old type of college graduate disappears, and the distinction between the educated and the illiterate ceases to be apparent. The purely "scientific" university man can sometimes command a higher salary than his unlettered brother, but his speech, manners, and interests are apt to be essentially those of the rude mechanical. No one would dream of asserting that the scientific expert is necessarily devoid of cultivation—hundreds of examples could instantly be cited in rebuttal; but he seeks and finds the refining influence outside of his specialty.

While we cannot, without reversing our whole ideal of education, make natural science the backbone of our system, we may be certain it will henceforth remain a conspicuous member. Man is both flesh and spirit, and we can no longer close our eyes to the importance of the material universe. The excessively monastic character of the old erudition will doubtless be corrected by an infusion of healthy realism.

Another study of great and growing popularity, which, however, has not yet clamored for pedagogical hegemony, obtains due recognition in the modern curriculum: history is doubly assured of permanence, through its intrinsic interest and through its affinity to literature; it is an indispensable concomitant both to the classics and to modern languages.

It is now becoming evident that the leading discipline, whatever be its nature, will never enjoy the exclusive rights nor hold the despotic sway so long exercised by Latin. In fact, the new education will be invertebrate; it will lack the closely knit, harmonious, symmetrical structure of the old school. Some compensation for this lost consistency will perhaps be found in broadened sympathy and a firmer grasp of reality. However this may be, it cannot be denied that, unless we are prepared to change utterly our conception of civilization, we must look to

some study for a part, at least, of the peculiar benefits heretofore conferred by Latin; and it is equally true that these can be afforded neither by mathematics nor by natural science, nor (it may be added) by history.

If, for lack of a worthier competitor, the mantle of the classics seems likely to fall upon modern languages, let it be worn with dignity and a becoming sense of responsibility. Our first duty is to ascertain what may be expected of us, what may be the duties of our new office. The inquiry must be addressed to the late incumbent. What did Latin do for the boy, which no other study could accomplish? Aside from the admirable mnemonic exercise afforded by inflections and vocabulary, Latin grammar teaches observation and judgment, Latin style develops the artistic instinct, Latin literature reveals the nobler aspects of human nature. The functions of case, tense, and mood form an ample course in philosophy; there can be no better lesson in logic than the disentangling of a Latin period; classical art is the basis of our æsthetic ideals; Roman history is the world's fountain-head of patriotism; ancient literature has been for ages our chief text-book of psychology. How much of all this can a modern language impart? Not all, but a large share; and if it has never been done hitherto, the failure has been due, not to the subject, but to the teacher. The modern language, to be sure, labors under a grave disadvantage. It has not the authority with which ancient privilege invests the classics. The introduction to Goethe and Victor Hugo is accompanied by none of the glorious circumstance with which the boy is ushered into the awful presence of Virgil or Cicero. On the other hand, the living tongue profits by the keen interest attaching to anything that is alive; it is, besides, more easily approached and better understood.

At this point the question arises: Which of the two languages, French and German, is the more competent to take the place of an ancient tongue? On the mnemonic side, German offers the superior attractions. In grammar, too, at first sight, it seems more akin to Latin; but on closer consideration, French, with its greater delicacy, its finer distinctions, and its subtler logic, appears better adapted than the more crudely mechanical German to

genuine intellectual exercise. Furthermore, the German alphabet, besides unduly taxing the eyes, forms a vexatious and utterly unprofitable obstacle to the beginner. It must be admitted, however, that French is far more difficult to teach. In literature there can hardly be a comparison: while German has a copious store of pretty and wholesome tales for children and can boast of a few great books for older minds, French, the most artistic of modern languages, presents, as soon as the elementary stage is passed, an abundance, a variety, a consecutive stream of masterpieces which we should seek in vain on the other side of the Rhine. It should be remembered, too, that, excepting the period of the early Renaissance, France has been, from the birth of the vulgar tongues, the literary center of Europe; more than any other land, it inherits the prestige of ancient Greece and Rome. Nevertheless, the choice will doubtless always be determined largely by local and personal considerations.

Whichever be the foreign language selected, both its labors and its responsibilities will be shared by English. Especially on the literary and æsthetic side the mother-tongue will be an invaluable ally; for strictly disciplinary purposes it is ill adapted. Between the two languages there must be constant and hearty co-operation; it is only through a genuine union of these two instruments that we can hope to rival the pedagogical success of Latin. After the preliminary stage—devoted to pronunciation and the rudiments of vocabulary, inflections, and syntax—should come a thorough course in comparative grammar: the relation between thought and its modes of expression; the real significance of case, tense, and mood; the logic of construction, the philosophy of idiom, should be minutely and intelligently examined in the two languages, and the pupil should be led to see how the same object is attained in different ways in the speech of different countries. When the student is far enough advanced, careful translation to and fro should be used to illustrate, not only the correspondences and the divergences of grammar and idiom, but also the niceties of expression and the canons of style. The French (or German) reading should be so chosen as to supplement the scholar's literary work in English; it should all be of

a character to arouse and cultivate the artistic sense, and at the same time afford the substantial meat upon which growing minds ought to feed.

An intelligent, properly equipped French teacher who really respects his office, if allowed a fair opportunity in the way of time and books, is bound to accomplish something that will make his subject worthy of respect. He will constantly ask himself whether he is doing the thing that will be of most lasting benefit to his pupils. He will compare his results, not with those of the linguistic mountebank, but with those of the best classical instruction. Slovenliness, half-knowledge, intellectual sloth, will be the objects of his unremitting warfare. His measure of accomplishment will not be the number of pages covered, but the extent and value of the information and experience which his pupils have obtained. If we can secure such teaching as this—half submerged though we be under the present wave of materialism—we need not be too despondent about the future: something of the old discipline will survive; and the international brotherhood of educated men, which once found its expression in the use of a common tongue, will reveal itself in mutual understanding and mutual sympathy.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass.

THE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE WORK IN MODERN LANGUAGES.

THE observer who compares the educational systems of continental Europe with what obtains in the United States is struck by nothing perhaps so strongly as by the fact that, while in the former there is a strongly marked dividing line between the work of the secondary schools and that of the higher institutions of learning, no such difference can be found in the American system. This is due mainly to the existence of a peculiarly American institution, the American college. The European system consists of three clearly defined grades of instruction—the primary, the secondary, and the higher or university; and it may be said, as a general statement, that no subject taught in the secondary schools is taught also, except in more advanced courses, in the universities. The United States have introduced a fourth grade, the college, which takes its place between the secondary school and the university, and the curriculum of which, when compared with the European system, is seen to partake both of secondary and university work. This fact, this lack of a dividing line between secondary school and college, would strike even the observer who confined his observations within the American field, for he would find the secondary much more strongly distinguished from the primary school than from the college.

This hybrid character of the college is becoming so widely recognized that there is no lack of those who have come to advocate the removal of this peculiar grade of instruction. What they want is practically the substitution of the European for the American system, and this they would effect by somewhat extending the secondary or high-school curriculum until it had practically absorbed the first two years, freshman and sophomore, of the college, while the third and fourth, junior and senior, became part of the university.

We have no hesitation in rejecting such a solution of a diffi-

cult problem as a remedy worse than the disease. The American college represents something more than a mere grade of instruction; it is a social institution the disappearance of which would soon result in a lowering of the intellectual standard of the whole community. The universities themselves would be among the first to suffer, for who can say how much they owe to the spirit of loyal devotion that binds the college graduate to his *alma mater*? A transfer of this spirit from the college to the university is hardly possible, or even desirable. All the elements which make up the sturdy and exhilarating college life, and which are in their place there, would be detrimental to the higher student, who ought to confine his attention to the mastering of the subjects that he has chosen for his special line of work. The solution, therefore, lies not in the destruction of an institution which has done so much already for the broad human society of which it is a part, but in a better adjustment of its relations with the other parts of the educational system of the country.

I do not intend here to deal with the whole of this important subject. In the course of studies of most of the high schools and academies we find courses in physics, in chemistry, in Latin, in Greek, which are duplicated in nearly every college. With these this paper has nothing to do. But when we come to the modern languages the problem presents some special features which seem to me worth considering. My remarks will deal solely with French, with the teaching of which I have been concerned for over a quarter of a century; but by their general nature they will be seen to apply as well to German as to French.

Elementary courses in French and German are found in most of the high schools and academies. They are found also in practically all colleges. The same is beginning to be true also of Spanish. The questions to be examined are: First, is it wise to have such courses in both kinds of institutions? Second, if not, where ought they to be retained and where dropped? Third, if retained in the lower schools, how far ought these to proceed, and where ought the college to begin its work in modern languages?

The first question seems to me of a general nature. In other words, is it wise to have high-school courses duplicated in the college? I do not hesitate to answer the question negatively. The atmosphere of the college is entirely different from the atmosphere of the secondary school. The college loses something of its dignity in the eyes of the student when he finds there courses which he has been used to consider preparatory to college, and even courses lower than some he has seen and gone through during his period of secondary studies. Another consideration is that, as the college is intimately linked with the university, every instructor there, if he is not to be considered an inferior man by the body of students, ought to give some instruction of a university character, and that the teacher who has charge of sections in elementary French or German has so much of his time and strength taken by what we may call the drudgery of teaching that he loses therein the freshness of mind required for higher work. That a number of college instructors do combine the two kinds of work is no answer to this argument, for the fact only bears witness to their uncommon energy, and it is well known that only the strongest among them succeed in carrying for a long time this double burden without breaking down under the strain.

I come now to the second question. If the teaching of elementary French is to be done only in secondary school or college, where ought it to be placed? Here the arguments in favor of the secondary school seem to me both obvious and irresistible. Whatever can be taught well in the secondary school ought to be taught there. That French can be is amply demonstrated by the success achieved in a number of private and public institutions, among which I am happy to name the high schools of the city of New York. Then it must be borne in mind that the high-school pupils do not all go to college. To drop French from the high-school curriculum would therefore have the deplorable result of depriving a large number of children of their only chance of learning French. And, finally, the teaching of a foreign language ought, as far as possible, not to go without some attention paid to the acquisition of an ability to speak it,

and for this kind of acquisition the child of high-school age is in much better condition than the older college student.

The third question, relating to the adjustment of work between college and high school, may seem at first to present more difficulties, and yet attention to some principles will allow giving to it too a reasonable answer. First, the teaching done in the secondary school should be able to stand by itself. It ought to constitute for the high-school graduate who does not go to college an acquisition that will stay with him, provided he takes reasonable care not to let it slip by. Therefore the secondary school should not be satisfied to stop at what is known as the elementary requirement for admission to college. This is altogether insufficient; unless supplemented by higher work, it will in after-life leave nothing in the mind of the student. He is not yet able to read with the consciousness of accuracy the French books which are really worth reading. Not so if he has pushed as far as the Intermediate, or better still the Advanced Examination as recommended by the report of the Committee of Ten.

But, on the other hand, the high school ought not to encroach upon the province of the college. But where does this province begin? It seems to me that it begins just where the student having mastered the difficulties presented by the printed French page is ready to get into the spirit of French literature. For such preparatory work, taking into consideration the age of the pupil, four courses of three periods each would not be too much, but ought to suffice. Taking Columbia College as an example, the adoption of such a system would eliminate from the list of French courses Course A and Course 1, dealing mainly with grammar, reading, and composition. College work would begin with Course 2, "General Introduction to the Study of French Literature," which already at this time is taken by a number of well-prepared freshmen. If the secondary schools would all do their work as well as some of them do, it would be possible to conduct such a course, at least partially, in French, and thus the college department, while not losing sight of its main province, the enlargement of the mind by an appreciation of a new literature, and the fostering of the scientific spirit by an

acquaintance with the method of Romance philology, would cease to be open to the oft-expressed criticism that its work in modern languages is of no practical value to the student. After following were it only one course in French literature conducted partially at the beginning and totally at the end in French, the good student would feel satisfied that he understands at least, even if he do not readily use, spoken French.

ADOLPHE COHN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

FRENCH INSTRUCTION IN CALIFORNIA—ITS AIMS AND METHODS.

THERE are probably only three cities in the United States whose French residents are sufficiently numerous or sufficiently well organized to be said to form a colony; these are New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco. The French residents of these cities have their clubs, churches, societies, libraries, newspapers, and representative men. The presence of such a colony in San Francisco has had its influence on French education in California, as most of the private teachers are native French men or women, and in the early history of the instruction most of the teaching in the schools was done by them. But the influence of organizations and publications in which French is the medium of communication is far less than it ought to be, and would be, if it were possible to bring about closer relations between the colony and the teachers of the state.

French began its public career in the seminaries and boarding schools gathered about the bay of San Francisco, where it was taught chiefly as an accomplishment, but it was not taught for its educational value till its study was advocated by the university. The University of California was founded in 1868, when modern-language instruction was as yet undeveloped; and French did not become a matriculation subject till many years later. The *Register* contented itself simply with repeating monotonously that "one year of Latin will help in the acquisition of the modern languages," that "early training in the pronunciation of the spoken language is strongly urged," and that "one year's instruction in grammar and pronunciation is desirable."

In 1880 the "accrediting" system was established under which members of the university faculty might be appointed to visit a secondary school, and if the school met the approval of these "visitors," its graduates could be "recommended" by the principal to enter the university without examination. At first the school was "accredited" or "rejected" as a whole; later, by

subjects. For this latter purpose a list of fourteen subjects was drawn up, but modern languages was not one of these. "A good reading knowledge of French or German" was constantly recommended in the *Register*; a student had the privilege of passing an examination, but his only reward was the permission to omit the elementary course in the Department of Modern Languages. During all this time the department itself was saying in its announcement that "the first two years will be devoted mainly to translation of French into English."

In 1891 Subject 15 was added to the list. This meant two years of French in a high school, and required "a knowledge of elementary grammar, ability to translate ordinary French at sight and to translate simple English into French." In 1897 there was considerable expansion in the university department, though the first two years were still devoted to translation. At the same time began a persistent effort to raise the standard of French instruction in the high schools.

The first complete "visitation" of the schools for French was made in 1900, and in 1901 a set of requirements was drawn up by the university on the report of the Committee of Twelve as a basis, under which an applicant from the schools might offer from two to four years of French. By this action French was put on the same basis as Latin. At the same time the department revised its own ideals and methods, especially in its attitude toward translation.

In 1894, 3 out of 57 schools were accredited in French; in 1896, 18 out of 76; in 1900, 34 out of 116; in 1901, 37 out of 118, 12 of these being accredited for the three-year course. This year (1904), 55 schools are on the list of applications for accrediting in French. This increase seems not to be at the expense of Latin or of German, and Spanish has more than doubled during the past few years.

What has stood in the way of progress in modern-language instruction in this state has been, first, its non-recognition by the university, and, second, the lack of prepared teachers. At first these teachers were mostly foreigners who taught by the "natural method" without system; later, as the university gained

influence in the state, these were supplanted by college graduates, who had learned to "translate" French, but who could not speak it. French was taught as a dead language, with a few brilliant exceptions in the large cities, where the teachers were members of the French colony who had received a university education. This insufficiency in the instruction became evident to the university "visitors," who realized at once that there must be better teachers, and that the university must prepare them. It is now engaged in this attempt, and is trying to send out men and women who can teach the French as a living language. Until the universities of the country undertake this task, we cannot hope for much progress in the teaching of the modern languages, for there is at present no place where young men and women can go for this preparation.

The insufficiency of the instruction has been owing in a great measure to the false method that has been in use. The main value of the study of a foreign language comes from the introduction of the learner to a new people; and since he usually cannot visit the foreign country, he must know this people from its literature. The main object, then, is to read the literature intelligently. The secondary object is to use the language in a commercial or social way. Of course, the thorough accomplishment of the chief aim would include the other, and any serious attempt to "read the literature intelligently" must carry with it greater or less proficiency in the spoken tongue.

In the matter of accomplishing these objects, California has had the experience of the rest of the Union. Happily there has been not much Grammar Method; not much Natural Method, except in private instruction, where it belongs. It is the so-called Reading Method that has been most in use and is the hardest to kill or to change into anything vital. It is recognized as a legitimate method, even by the Committee of Twelve. Since it consists generally of translating French into English it is really not reading at all, but a Translation Method. This is the method that is probably most in vogue in the United States, as it is the only one which graduates of colleges, as a rule, can use. Besides, those under the sway of classic traditions in

language teaching, those who are insufficiently prepared, and those who think that in two years it is not worth while to try anything else, all fall readily into this.

A true method must teach the student: (*a*) to understand a French text without being first obliged to translate it; (*b*) to express thought in French without first formulating it in English. The end of the instruction is rather not to translate, and it is evidently illogical to hope to attain this end by persistent translation. The student in reading French under this scheme makes a rapid transliterating into a hybrid tongue, which is neither French nor English, and thinking in this day after day cannot but be educationally demoralizing. Education consists in forming correct habits, and the fundamental error of the Translation Method lies in the fact that it frankly and deliberately confirms the learner in the very habit that he is trying to break up. It must, therefore, be educationally unsound. The Committee of Twelve recommends that the deadness of this method be relieved by some oral work and some exercises in composition, but these exercises, being of such a nature as to confirm the student in the translation attitude of mind are, therefore, futile.

A true method must take into account and make use of the strong associations which exist between an object and its English name. The English word is for the learner the best definition of the French word—better even than the object itself, as the group of associations which cluster about the English word he may transfer at once to the French word. For instance, *arbre* is a general term of which no single tree, like an oak, gives a complete idea, whereas "tree," gives the conception at once. This evidently may be a great help in learning a language, if the learner will at once transfer to *arbre* the associations connected with "tree," and the main efforts of a sound method must be bent toward making sure the transferring of these associations. The Translation Method fails in this, since the learner is not taught to make this transfer; he sees or hears the word *arbre*, which suggests "tree," and it is the English word that carries the associations.

I know of a number of students who had learned to read French fairly in a well-taught secondary school. In college they were put into a class where they translated persistently for a year, after which they entered a class in literature where it was necessary to read voluminously. These students had lost their power of reading French, and lamented constantly the fact that they had acquired a habit of mind that was not only useless, but destructive of their appreciation of the foreign language.

One is struck by the attitude of language teachers generally toward translation. In a collection of essays by various professors of modern languages, published in 1896, translation is taken for granted by most of the writers. Some of them advocate it openly. One says that the object of the study of French is "to translate the literature;" another speaks of the "rapid, clear-cut work which translation in the modern languages is so well adapted to give." Nearly all of them advocate "translation at sight." "Reading must begin by translation," and "the thoughtful translation of literary masterpieces cannot fail to refine the taste." "Translation should not be literal." Even an advocate of the Natural Method says that "translation should be postponed as long as possible." "It is wise to translate consciously and in *words* as we read. There is no better aid in mastering our vernacular." "Translation at hearing should be practiced constantly in the study of language."

There is no doubt but that the instruction in modern languages in the United States is based on the Translation Method. It has become so much a tradition that it is taken for granted in all our texts and books of instruction. As translation is substituted for reading, so is composition for the writing of French; and what is composition but translation reversed? It is against this habit that I am protesting here. I want to throw this whole matter into such doubt that text-book writers shall be obliged to take a conscious stand, and if they use the words "translation" and "composition," they shall be obliged to explain and defend them.

In the usual study of a dead language like the Latin, the grammar is learned theoretically, and then by means of a dic-

tionary the text is translated into English. Pronunciation is not important; neither is a ready vocabulary imperative. The whole procedure is reflective and consists all the way through of a comparison of the Latin with the English. Of course, French may be studied in this way, but it is to make it a dead language.

A different procedure is necessary in the living languages. An exact pronunciation and a ready vocabulary are very important; the grammar must be practical, even instinctive. A slavish habit of using grammar and dictionary is destructive of progress in the modern tongues. The procedure here is not comparative, but direct. The learner should be taught persistently to make an effort to get the thought directly from the spoken or printed sentence without the intervention of the English.

The pronunciation is the foundation of a living language. We have been teaching this by mere imitation, but the time has come for a more scientific training of ear and tongue. Whether we use the apparatus of the Phonetic Method or not, it is certain that we cannot longer ignore this fundamental part of the instruction. There is no doubt but that the instruction should begin with a study of the sounds of the language, and for this purpose a small, well-chosen list of names of common objects is the best. After a sound is thoroughly mastered, that is, can be recognized and produced, its association with its written symbol is not a difficult matter. The very prevalent method of teaching pronunciation by pronouncing a text before it is understood sins by beginning with the symbols instead of the sounds. It is generally coupled with the Translation Method, and will disappear at the same time.

The understanding of a French text and its translation are two different things. The procedure by which a student "pronounces" a text and then "translates" it is vicious in two respects: it makes the learner self-satisfied in an easy knowledge which is not genuine, and it confirms him in an attitude of mind which renders him incapable of appreciating French literature. A better way to proceed on the part of the teacher is to have the learner answer questions about the text, explain it, give a summary of it—all in French; and then read it with

proper phrasing and expression. If the teacher will resolve to get at the student's understanding of a text without having him translate it, he will not only give him an appreciation of the text itself, but a great deal of useful practice in handling the language. What is usually practiced in schools under the name of translation is putting set English expressions in place of set French ones. Translation itself is not a method at all, but a difficult art which is possible only to those who have a ready command of both languages.

"Composition" is the reverse of "translation," that is, putting set French expressions in place of set English ones. Composition in English means writing English, but the word in foreign-language nomenclature refers to this transliteration, which is not writing at all. These words "translation" and "composition" correspond to the French *version* and *thème*—relics of the past, come down from the old Latin instruction. The sooner we banish them and what they stand for, the better. We are trying to teach people to read, write, and speak French, and not to translate, compose, and pronounce it.

What I am saying here is in line with the work of the reformers in Europe, who speak of their method as the "New," "Reform," "Direct," or "Phonetic." The first year in the high school should be chiefly imitative, with much oral instruction; the grammar should be inductive; the whole effort should be bent toward giving an intuitive feeling for the language. Reading should be introduced early, and should go on with speaking and writing. The great difficulty with us is the lack of suitable texts, because existing texts have been edited to be worked out with grammar and dictionary after the manner of the Latin classics, and the attempt is made to bring the text within the comprehension of beginners by abundant notes. This is futile. A student must work up to a French classic just as he would work up to a symphony of Beethoven—by graded exercises. What we need, therefore, is an abundance of easy texts—stories written for the purpose or simplified from existing tales. The student should have a text whose structural difficulties are not beyond him; and this can be made the basis for all the exercises of the class.

Writing can be begun almost as soon as reading. As we are trying to create an instinctive feeling for the language, it should be based on the text, first by answering questions then by summaries, then by explanations. When the student can express an opinion about the text, he is beginning his emancipation from the model. These summaries are invaluable, as the student passes gradually from them to original expression. There is no harm in having him make a summary of everything he reads, either orally or in writing.

Speaking should be carried on constantly from the first. The vocabulary should be small, and should consist of the names of familiar objects and ideas. If a learner can speak about the ordinary things of life, it is an easy matter for him to apply this power to other subjects.

A rapid translation into English takes place at first with every learner of a language; when he sees a pen the word "pen" will come to his mind first, and afterwards *plume*. To speak French he must momentarily drop the English association, and to help him toward this, we must make as much of a French atmosphere as possible in the class-room. At any rate, it is wise to act as if the double association did not take place, and to make the work so rapid and clear that he can think only French. Right here is the core of French instruction. We are not attempting to destroy the English associations, but to build up French ones also, so that the student shall become bilingual. This is why there is so much talk about "creating a French atmosphere," by using French in class, by means of charts, pictures, maps, and books. A teacher may ask a student to give the English for a French word or phrase, but evidently only with the idea of giving him the proper associations to connect with the French expression. The English must be dropped at once.

Here in California we have passed through the grammar stage, and the natural-method stage. At the present time we are struggling with the translation evil.

Of course, French cannot be taught in two years, but very much of value can be taught in that time and correct foundations

can be laid. The shortness of the time at least is no excuse for a false method. We must show that the modern languages have objects and methods of their own; that they encroach on no other field; that they have as much educational value as Latin; that they are supplementary to it, and not antagonistic. We must show that four good years of French are equal to four good years of Latin. If we get these, we shall not simply "translate" a few classics, but shall teach our students to read the unsurpassed French literature, and at the same time lay foundations for business or travel.

The report of the Committee of Twelve has done much toward systematizing French instruction in this country. It is now time to complete its work. There should be a revision of its discussion of *méthodes* with full references to the literature of the modern reforms. The suggested courses for the four years should be gone over, and especially should there be a list of texts, worked out with great care and graded as exactly as is possible.

SAMUEL A. CHAMBERS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

TRANSLATION.

IF language could be correctly described as a receptacle of thought, translation would be an easy task, and, like any other mechanical art, could be brought to perfection. It would be necessary merely to connect two languages in the mind of a person who knew them both, when the thought, like liquid through a syphon, would flow from one into the other without the loss of a single drop. But this analogy, which by the way is seldom met with nowadays, does not correspond even remotely to fact. The connection between thought and language is not mechanical and external, but vital and essential. Thought and language represent various aspects of a common operation. It is true that it is in our power to attend, now to one aspect of this operation, now to another: otherwise we should not be able to differentiate grammar from logic; but the possession of this faculty of discrimination does not imply in the smallest degree a differentiation in the operation itself. Language and thought are coextensive, inseparable, perhaps even identical. They have been so from their origin throughout the entire period of their growth.

The form of our thought and language is determined by environment; it varies from country to country. Moreover, a generation does not construct its thought afresh for itself; it inherits the major part of it through language from ancestors. Language is the savings bank of civilization, the varieties of which are so great that it may be safely affirmed that the concepts which embody them have never more than local import, that the chance of one word having the same meaning as another, or of any word retaining the same meaning for a considerable period of time, is infinitesimal. Even such an abstraction as "hope" is not absolutely the same as *l'espérance*. *L'espérance* has shades of suggestion reflective of the elasticity of the French temperament and the illusions of French history, while "hope" takes a more sober hue from the practical character of the nation which produced it, one of whose greatest modern representatives could even say: "Hope,

that liar." Certain words, such as "yesterday," and, in general, time and space relations regarded solely as such, contain no deposit of culture, no possibilities of variation; certain others, such as *cuisine*, *ennui*; "gentleman," "home," "sport," "steeple-chase," are so laden with residue of innumerable local experiences that usually no attempt is made to find for them what for convenience we call equivalents.¹ With the conjoining of concepts (and names) in such expressions as *le bon Dieu*, *bonne maman*, "dry goods" (Amer.), "note of hand;" or in sentences such as "*Ça saute aux yeux*," "*Un tiens vaut mieux que deux tu l'auras*," "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush," "Three cheers for France!" the possibilities of divergence between languages are increased. And so on through the ascending scale, until we reach style, which is an intensely personal thing, especially when allied to verse. In verse the thought is wedded to a certain cadence, rhythm, meter, perhaps even rhyme. The metrical system used is actively determinant of the course of the thought. Thus Dante, whose resources were apparently limitless, confesses that in the interest of his rhymes "he had made words say what they were not wont to express for other poets." How much more is the thought dictated by the exigencies of versification to poets of lesser range! Heine considered the French metrical system "a strait-jacket invented by Procrustes." Racine's verse represents a perfectly specific, conventional form of art and theory of life. The identity of art and life is felt in every line. To translate him is to discard all his harmonies, especially that of his magnificent verse; to rob him of half his strength and meaning by robbing him of almost all his beauty. To translate him into verse is to impose on oneself a series of new conditions which entail a virtual abandonment of the original. What difficulties attend the path of the translator, and how necessary that he should understand the limitations prescribed for him by the

¹Canadian French furnishes interesting material for a study of equivalents. It contains a number of words which have been borrowed from English simply because the proper French names for things have never been brought forcibly before the popular consciousness. On the other hand, the effort to conserve the interests of French has resulted in such linguistic monstrosities as *l'Orateur de la Chambre* (the Speaker), *La Puissance du Canada* (the Dominion of Canada).

nature of his task! There can be no question of conveying the thought of an author in its entirety through another medium. For, not only, as already hinted, is this so-called medium part of the thought of the writer, but there are no precise equivalents for any of its elements. Fortunately there are broad resemblances in the life of peoples as well as of individuals; we are related by a community of need and feeling, by a similarity of physical environment. Certain world-institutions have shaped us in a common mold. These similarities in life and *milieu*, just like the dissimilarities alluded to above, are reflected in language. It is the business of the translator to hunt out the former, and by a skilful use of them to minimize the dividing effect of the latter. In particular he should press into service all the resources of the recipient tongue. He is aided in his task by a certain beautiful power of language. Words in their natural environment, *i. e.*, in sentences, are not static, but dynamic. Each word is affected by all its neighbors, gives up to them, it may be, a part of its meaning, or is reinforced thereby. A word may respond sensitively to each episode in an entire story. Thus I found it necessary to postpone the translation of the title of *Das edle Blut* (Wildenbruch) and *L'Arrabbiata* (Heyse) until my class had finished the narratives themselves. The office of a translator is not unlike that of a painter in the possibilities of shading by contrast and harmony with environment. A translator having to render the union of two concepts does not need to look for the two concepts in the recipient language which are least unlike them. He may, and very often does, reproduce the effect by a grouping of words which taken individually have no relation to the original; *e. g.*, he may render *le nez au vent* by "his head held high," ignoring the objects so picturesquely linked in the French. I see, on casting my eye over the annotations of some texts which I have edited, that they contain hundreds of phrases which can be rendered only by a wide departure from the wording, *i. e.*, from the grouping of concepts—of the original. To translate them literally would provoke laughter, create an impression of grotesqueness, than which nothing could interfere more fatally with the rendering of a writer's ideas.

Certain conclusions result from the foregoing analysis, some of which are merely of academic interest, while others are of consequence to the work of the class-room.

The effect of a translation is not to be judged solely by comparison with the original. A translation—I am not speaking now of translation in the class-room, where, as we shall see, the main purpose is to get as quickly as possible into the heart of the foreign language—a translation is made for persons who have no knowledge of a language, or it has no *raison d'être*. It follows that a quaintness of phrasing and reminiscent literalness which to the scholar, whose eye reverts constantly to the original, seem pardonable enough, are to be rated as defects. Henry James appears to have lost feeling for the foreignness of certain literally rendered French phrases. It may be doubted whether Mr. Norton's unswerving fidelity to the imagery of the *Divine Comedy* is appropriate to those passages of which in his preface he admits that the form was dictated to Dante by the "musical bond." When the quaintness, however, is in the *subject* of the original, in the *civilization* it represents, and is not made to appear as if it were part of the writer's *presentment of himself to his readers*, the case is different. All works currently included under the name of literature, in particular all texts which figure in modern-language courses, are addressed to the special public which speaks the language in which they are written. The implication of a relation to a special public is part of their meaning and message. A translation from a foreign book should preserve a certain exotic flavor representing this irreducibility of one civilization into the terms of another. It should not be such "that the reader should if possible forget that it is a translation at all, and be lulled into the illusion that he is reading an original work—something original from an English hand."¹ For if it be true that writers do not, as a rule, impress their own special public as quaint, it is also true that to any man whose individuality has not been washed away by cosmopolitanism, a new civilization, and even an unknown feature of the same, presents itself as strange.

¹Quoted by MATTHEW ARNOLD in his *On Translating Homer*.

A translation to be ideal must be executed as a whole. The translator must not "lose sight of the forest for the trees." It is not enough to find happy renderings of passages in isolation. Matthew Arnold in his essay *On Translating Homer* declares the aim of the translator to be the production of a "general effect." Mr. Charles E. Norton in the preface to his translation of the *Divine Comedy* says it is to give the "intellectual and emotional substance with as close a correspondence as possible to the tone and style of the original."

Translating should be preceded by a study, both conscious and subconscious, of an author's style. As for the power of subconscious study, nature alone decides whether a translator is to have it in generous or limited measure. Little can be done for him, if he lacks the instinct of language, by laying down rules; little gained by him from a study of the great models.¹ On the other hand, he will find it helpful to formulate the characteristics of a particular style. Thus Victor Hugo's dialogue in *Ruy Blas* will be seen to be alert and elastic, his phrasing brief and nervous, his instinct for local color intense, at times exaggerated, *e. g.*, in his use of Arabic-Spanish terms: *alguazil*, *argousin*, *algarade*, *alcade*, etc.; his action rapid, his imagery brilliant, his principal character monstrously stagey, his sentiment commonplace, his rhetoric in the monologues a thundering Niagara.² Or, to take another example, George Sand's habitual style, the style of *Indiana* and *Valentine*, is, to use Henry James's happy phrase, "noble and imperturbable," has a "grand felicity of expression." Her prose, written without effort and without having passed through tentative, initiatory stages, is eloquent, ardent, ample, beautiful. She said: "There is nothing in me; *another* sings within me as it lists." In the *Mare au Diable*, which is more frequently read in class than any other of her novels, what is particularly known by the name of her "style" is represented in the two opening chapters only. The story proper is couched in an idealized transcript of the peasant talk

¹ My excuse for not including in this paper a study of the great translations is that it would lead me beyond the limits of a review article.

² See FAGUET, *Dix-neuvième siècle*, Victor Hugo, p. 204.

in Berry. It is not the words and accents of the peasant that are reproduced, as in our "kail-yard" novels, but earthy savor of speech, blended pedantry and simplicity; in short, atmosphere. As a rule, the personal characteristics of an author's style surpass in importance the distinctive notes which he lends to his individual characters. Nevertheless, account must be taken by the translator of the expression given to varieties of character and situation. "Little fish must not talk like whales," unless the author has erred by making them do so. A translation should keep on the same social level as the original; it should reflect colloquialisms, quaintness, servility, kingliness, etc.; archaisms should be rendered by archaisms, proverbs by proverbs. It is advisable, as a rule, to neglect puns. A philosophical justification of this attitude might be found in the fact that puns do not further the main purpose of language—communication of ideas; a poetic in Victor Hugo's words: "*Le calembour est la fiente de l'esprit.*"

The pursuit of an ideal form in class at all times would probably retard progress. Pupils in moderns must cover a certain amount of ground. I recommend that from time to time certain chosen passages be prescribed to be translated at home in writing in conformity with as many as possible of the ideal requirements. The more careful formulation of ideal translation is synonymous with greater exactness of comprehension. More important still, translation is an excellent exercise in the teaching of English. For younger pupils translation would seem to possess advantages over independent composition. It involves a greater amount of search and balancing, a cultivation of the ear and judgment. Oxford men, who are distinguished by their nice use of English, are trained by translation of the Greek and Latin classics. If modern languages are to fill worthily the place from which they have pushed the ancient, they cannot afford to neglect this side of their work. Lowell says:

In reading such books as chiefly deserve to be read in any foreign language, it is wise to translate consciously and in words as we read. There is no such help to a fuller mastery of our vernacular. It compels us to such a choosing and testing, to so nice a discrimination of sound, propriety, position, and shade of meaning, that we now first learn the secret of the words we have

been using or misusing all our lives, and are gradually made aware that to set forth even the plainest matter as it should be set forth is not only a very difficult thing, calling for thought and practice, but an affair of conscience as well. Translation teaches us as nothing else can, not only that there is a best way, but that it is the only way.

The dictionary is the student's *vade mecum*. The ideal dictionary would be one in which words were treated as dynamic, *i. e.*, always placed in their environment. The dimensions of such a book would render it, of course, impracticable. *By attending to the static aspect of a word*, however, we are enabled to give definitions which include the main part of its connotation, or equivalents which are proximate in meaning. A detached meaning of this kind may be an entity by convention only, indeed may be merely a rude approximation; it is nevertheless indispensable in practice. One frequently hears the assertion made that it is a good exercise for a student to choose among these approximations the one which comes nearest to suiting his purpose. I fail to see that this operation contains any mental discipline whatever. The belief that it does so is based on the false assumption that when a choice is made among meanings the translation is complete, that among the general meanings one is correct. There is mental discipline in applying one of these meanings to the passage to be translated, *in adjusting it insensibly to its environment and searching for equivalents to render, not the isolated word, but the thought*. It follows that the ordinary dictionary, with its bewildering multiplicity, is less serviceable than a well-made special vocabulary containing little not actually required for the translation of the text. It follows also that it is a pernicious illusion to suppose that "anybody" can make a vocabulary. I do not hesitate to say that no part of a scholar's work calls for more judgment, scholarship, and instinct for language. For none is it more imperative that good bilingual men should be secured. I venture to add a few practical hints from my own experience gained in making vocabularies for two texts. When a fairly common meaning exists, which shows the connection of a word with its root or its elements, it should be given, even although not exemplified in the text. It should be put first, and be clearly marked off from the others. A knowl-

edge of the divination of a word rounds out a student's lexicological information, and lightens the work of memory. The most usual meaning (or meanings) should come next—in the absence of an etymological meaning it would come first—; it should likewise be given, even when not exemplified in the text, and should be marked off clearly from the others. Students should learn it by heart. Meanings should be classified by types. No unnecessary meaning should be given. The meaning selected by a student for a special passage in the text should be used to bring the word looked up into touch with its environment. The transformed—*i. e.*, the real—meaning should be recognized and impressed upon the mind; I do not say that it should be necessarily learned by heart. Idioms should be translated as wholes. Except when they contain no word which an average student would need to look up—in which case they might for reasons of expediency appear among the annotations—they should be placed in the vocabulary, and listed under the word most likely to be unknown to students. If we consulted the interests of the best students only, it might be advisable to add nothing more. For those who lack the power to perform the dynamic readjustment of meaning to environment, it seems to me necessary to add meanings which, by simple incorporation in the English sentence most likely to result from an ordinary person's efforts, will make good English. In cases where the required meanings are such as not to suggest themselves at all to a person who, knowing the two languages perfectly, is unaware of the environment of the words in question, it would be almost necessary to supply environment. The limit to such treatment can naturally not be prescribed. The more environment, the better.

I find it wonderfully stimulating to students to appeal to them for a *better word* than the one which may have occurred to myself. I find it an excellent exercise to explain to them in what points the words they suggest are inadequate. When they are translating a prose writer, I do not find it necessary to tolerate any of the grotesque stuff which passes current under the name of literal translation. It is surprising with what quickness a student can be brought to see that such translation is false.

I have found it a good plan also, when obliged to cover a large amount of ground, to read the text aloud with exaggerated antithesis and much show of Frenchness, throwing in, as I advance rapidly, the translation of a word or phrase which from my knowledge of students I consider likely to be misunderstood.

As the main purpose of translation is to get into the heart of the original, it seems to follow as a matter of course that as soon as a passage is understood or translated, it should be read aloud. And when I say read, I do not mean articulated, or spoken as if it were a meaningless arrangement of words which by much twisting and turning could be made over into something fairly sensible, but as if it were a piece of literature appealing at first hand to a reader's sensibilities. When the text is good—and what right have we to offer any other kind to our students—I insist on their enjoying it.

It may be said: Would it not be better to discard translation in the class-room altogether, seeing that even ideal translation is so imperfect, and that most frequently one must be content with a makeshift counterpart of the same? I do not hold a brief for translation as opposed to the various "natural" methods. The merits of the rival systems are discussed in the Report of the Committee of Twelve. I believe that translation even when unideal can be very profitable. It is found to be indispensable in the vast majority of schools. I have stated briefly how the practice may be pursued with least handicap and most profit. I write for "translationists."

LEIGH R. GREGOR.

McGILL UNIVERSITY,
Montreal, Canada.

THE TEACHING OF MODERN LANGUAGES UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS.

THE teaching of foreign languages has always been a vexing problem of the schools. One could make this statement, with the same degree of truth, regarding the teaching of languages in general, not excluding the mother-tongue and the classic Greek and Latin.

Toward the latter two the world has, however, taken an attitude of resignation and is willing to go on studying, without the faintest hope of ever learning them, simply because five centuries of routine have made of them the basis of higher education, and because the study of Greek and Latin constitutes a distinction—though artificial and false—between the educated and the uneducated.

There is something pathetic in the cowardly yielding of whole nations and generations to the classical phantom, but men's craving for distinctions once admitted, the particular means which they choose to mark them are of little importance. Although it is not sure that such social differences should be abolished, it is desirable and good from time to time to say that they are nothing but signs of a weakness inherent in human nature.

A friend of the writer once stated the position and value of Greek and Latin wittily and truly: "They are," he said, "like the two buttons we wear on our coats, behind. These buttons are now useless, and few men know or care to know why they happen to be there. Yet, cut yours off and every one will notice and comment upon it. And inasmuch as for the average mind it is always painful to be an object of comment, we go on wearing buttons without buttonholes and really there is in it no great harm." We must be tolerant, and the writer is quite willing that the two classical buttons should continue to hang on our educational coat until they happen to drop off.

Our schools, colleges, and universities teach, however, or

pretend to teach, other languages, living ones; and they do so for another reason than that which makes them lose so much valuable time on Greek and Latin. They teach French, German, Italian, etc., because the knowledge of these languages today is as indispensable as writing and reckoning, and because public opinion, and rightly so, demands that they be taught.

And now what happens? In answer to this question it would be easy for a Voltaire to write a few pages of that marvelous prose full of sparkling wit and burning sarcasm by which he attacked the ignorance and the hypocrisy of his own time. But not being Voltaire, and, on the other hand, writing for people who know full well the evil and are honestly trying to correct it, the writer only wishes to submit here, not a panacea, but a few suggestions, and to contribute, in an humble measure, to the solution of the problem.

The fundamental error in language-teaching lies in the attitude generally prevailing in the class-room. Language is not a science, but an art, and must be approached, taught, and learned as such. The writer knows that in final analysis there is little difference between art and science, that there is a supreme point where they meet and merge. To illustrate this, the famous cupola of St. Peter's might serve as an example. It was only through repeated attempts and numerous corrections that Buonarroti succeeded in finding the ideal curve which is one of the triumphs of human genius. After the artist came the scientists. They measured, calculated, and finally proved by $a + b$ that the marvelous line is, at the same time, the one which gives the greatest strength. In this case art and science reached the meeting-point, but by different paths; and it is with these different paths in mind that we speak of art and science. Among many other instances Musset's poetry is a most striking one: he applied psychology and invented its terminology long before that new science, which is still in its infancy, was born. Art, then, precedes science. It has its source in the innermost fibers of the human soul. It is intuitive, final, infallible, and eternal. It is a gift of God. Science is conscious, provisional, ephemeral, and subject to corrections. Where is the science of

the sixteenth century? With all their science and their figures, would a thousand scientists working together for a thousand years have found the curve of St. Peter's dome, and despite their *proof*, is there no other line which would give as much or more strength to the edifice? Who dares to say that there is none, and, on the other hand, who can conceive of one more perfect?

The artist is pregnant with an idea or a vision, and his purpose is to express it in a material form. The expression is seldom adequate, but that is because our means of expression are insufficient. This limitation does not prevent the artist from continuing his work. On the contrary, it incites him and gives him increased power in his noble struggle with form. Were he pusillanimous enough to wait until his means of expression were equal to his conception, or foolish enough to look for set rules by which he might realize his ideal, he would never work, but would remain useless all his life. Ask any great artist how he does things, and he will laugh at you or perhaps worse. He purely and simply does his work, and it amazes him to read the learned article of the learned "person" telling the world how and why he did it. It is easy for Boileau to write his *Art poétique* after reading the works of his illustrious friends. Corneille is tiresome and little only when he tries to explain what a tragedy should be. Any Master of Arts can tell you how a novel should be constructed, and how the ideal sonnet must be handled. The too numerous art and literary critics all gain money and fame informing the public why this work and that are great. Did ever one of these nauseous pontiffs teach a man how to write or to paint? Is all of Ruskin's sententious rubbish worth the meanness of Whistler's sketches? Did ever a grammarian teach a man to speak? Did all the professors of style and literature ever produce a poet? And how many have they killed?

To do things is the alpha and omega of art. And if speaking and writing a language is an art, the only way to acquire it is to speak and write it, not to talk about it. If a man wants to learn how to draw, the master puts before him a sheet of paper, in his hand a pencil, and makes him draw some simple object—a cup, an inkstand, or a potato. He does not

lecture to him on the industry of paper making, or the history of art; nor need he mention who invented oil-painting, or in what year Leonardo da Vinci painted the Joconde, who was the girl sitting as his model, or what make of brushes and colors he used on that occasion.

Things of equal relative value form the bulk of language-teaching in our best institutions. Nothing but talk about the language to be studied. The language itself is completely absent from the lesson. Generally, in addition to grammar, translation is resorted to. They call it composition, but it is translation notwithstanding, and is to language study what the printed model is to drawing.

It is unnecessary to insist upon the result. The tree is to be judged by the fruit, and this tree is as barren as a telegraph pole.

What, then, shall take its place? This question is extremely difficult to answer, as nothing is harder to describe than how to do a thing. You might as well lay down rules to win battles. Even the minutest recipe for cooking a certain dish can be followed only by a born cook. And this leads us to the very heart of the whole difficulty the question of the teacher. Tell me who the teacher is, and I shall tell you what the lesson is. Like poets, great teachers are born, and it is doubtful whether they are born in larger numbers. Counting half a dozen in one generation for every nation is a liberal supposition. But unlike poets, or at least more easily than poets, teachers can be made; otherwise pedagogy is a farce, and we would do well to close our normal schools. As old Montaigne puts it, take a man with "his head well made rather than well filled"—that is to say, a man with common-sense—inspire him, do not overburden him with work, so that he may find time to think on what he is doing, and give him a free hand. After some experience—for experience is as necessary to the teacher as it is to the carpenter—he will discover the true principles, though not in all cases carried out by the same method or means. The latter he will select according to his temperament, immediate needs, and the material on which he is working. In no case will he fall into routine and idle talk; and success will be his reward. He will, however,

have to work for it and work hard. The teacher's is no easy task. A man who teaches two hours a day needs no further physical exercise. All he requires is rest so as to be fresh again the next day, for teaching is an eternal recommencement. Sisyphus's rock is the teacher's work symbol. And for all that he will receive, if he is lucky, from a thousand to two thousand dollars a year—less than a good coachman! The problem of teaching language, like the whole school question, is chiefly a financial one. Money buys everything, even good teachers.

Excellent handbooks have been published which can serve as a guidance for the teacher and as a memento for the student. But that is the limit of their usefulness. No book, even if it were of divine inspiration, can lead to success in language-teaching, if the instructor is not the soul of the lesson. A teacher who is willing to be the mere commentator of a book, to hide behind it, as it were, is not worthy of his calling. Rousseau wanted to banish every book from the schoolroom, and if such an extreme measure does not seem advisable, it is only because few teachers reach the high point of skill and power where one can dispense with help.

It is from the teacher's lips that the student must receive every new notion. This notion, perceived at the beginning by the eye, is then registered in the shape of language by the ear and not the eye. That is to say, the teacher of French, for instance, first *shows* the objects or the facts and clads them, *viva voce*, with the French words which represent them, without considering either the written language or the pupil's vernacular. Later on, the written language is introduced; the student then reads and writes it as naturally and as easily as he does his own.

Translation should always be rigorously avoided. Translation is not, and cannot be, a means of studying a language efficiently. Experience has shown it, and reason proves it. In order to translate one language into another, common sense tells us that one should know both languages. Access to a hundred dictionaries makes no difference. The study of one's own dictionary is a most interesting and profitable occupation for a man like Théophile Gautier, to whose mind each word brings a com-

plete image, and who thus enriches his vocabulary. But how can we expect a student to choose among the half-dozen French words he finds for every English word, and *vice versa*?

Since our ideas are infinitely more numerous than our words, each language is compelled to extend or multiply the meaning of the individual word, or, in other terms, to resort to figures and metaphors, which has caused it to be said that a language is but a collection of metaphors. Take, for instance, the word "operation." It means a different thing as you speak of a surgeon, a banker, a general, or a mathematician. "Whitewash" is another thing in politics than in the building industry. Now, nobody will be surprised to hear that each language extends and multiplies the meanings of words in a special manner according to its individual genius, and that this genius is not patent in the dictionaries. To translate "What is the matter?" by "*Quelle est la matière?*" "Good morning" by "*Bon matin,*" or "I am warm" by "*Je suis chaud,*" is meaningless. Yet these are instances in the writer's daily experience, and illustrate what can be done with a dictionary and the habits resulting from its use. All a student can do is to take his chance and guess.

Translation is only a result of language study, and a very unsatisfactory one at the best. As a means of study it is fatal to the most willing and the best gifted student. Each word translated is a step backward, for at the least subsequent difficulty the pupil ceases all effort to understand and only looks for the equivalent in his vernacular, whether there be one or not. Every word can be made clear, and is only made so absolutely, without translation, either by definition, by antithesis, by analogy, or, above all, by context.

From the known to the unknown, from the ensemble to the detail, are the two great principles in teaching. Through a series of skilful questions the student is brought to the new word or the new sentence as the horse to the obstacle, and, without giving him time to hesitate, the teacher prompts the new term, which afterward he incorporates into other sentences, until he is sure that the student has absorbed it. Acquired in this way, the words become as familiar to the pupil as his own language and

impress themselves deeply in the memory. The teacher ought to know how to draw and to draw quickly; the blackboard is indispensable. He must also be a good mimic, for the facts which can be represented by drawing are limited, while one can mimic almost everything. There are many other means which a real teacher soon discovers, and by which the whole vocabulary of a language can be taught, and effectively taught, without translation. Vocabulary, moreover, is, in a great measure acquired by intuition and observation. Words are not a set of disparate and arbitrary signs. They belong to families, with a head to each, and a genealogy less complicated than that of an average king. All the student needs in this respect is to be made conscious of the fact. For the rest, trust to his intelligence. Besides, language is not so much a matter of vocabulary. It is astonishing how much can be done with relatively few words, and how little sometimes with the aid of half a dozen dictionaries. Some of the greatest masterpieces are monochromes. Racine uses 1,400 words.

To teach words for their own sake is a dangerous folly which should be dealt with by the medico-legal courts. If words have any value, it is as signs of ideas, and language, being only the expression of something else, cannot be studied by itself, no more than you can draw without drawing something or somebody.

What has been already said with reference to translation is especially true regarding grammar. In its origin and in its function language is essentially intuitive, spontaneous, not rational. It is the product, not of individual initiative, but of folk-psychology, whose laws are extremely difficult to deduct and to formulate. Happily, we need not know these laws in order to follow them. No man when speaking has a conscious knowledge of the principles of speech, any more than of its organic production. And even the more he tries to be conscious of these principles, the less well he speaks. Furthermore, while in a language there is nothing arbitrary, in the strictest sense of the word, for every fact has its motive, yet there is nothing which could not be reasonably imagined to be different. The

past participle of *faire* could be *fat*. It is therefore in its *esse* rather than in its *fieri* that a language must be studied first; and this applies chiefly to grammar. Here languages differ even more than in lexicology; and translation leads to chaos. The subtle mechanism of the clearest and most logical language becomes arbitrary, incomprehensible, and false when judged by the standard of another. In order to retain its force and its dignity, a language must be isolated, and those who would learn it must do so in much the same way they learned their mother-tongue, or as the immigrant learns English when he comes to the United States. Approached in this way no language is either easy or difficult. French, German, Russian, and Chinese children learn their mother-tongue as readily as American children learn English, and so it seems that the best attitude in language study is reached by a complete abandonment of psychological analysis.

There are those who adopt half measures and proclaim that, while it is desirable to study a language from within, the student's vernacular is of great help for indispensable and time-saving explanations; they ridicule the teacher who, rather than resort to translation, devotes no little time to making clear the meaning of one word, while they could do so in the time it takes to utter the translation; they scorn the object-lesson and the blackboard, call them kindergarten devices, and are fond of saying that the reason why other teachers do not translate is because these teachers do not know the pupils' language well enough.

Taking these arguments in their order one can answer thus: (1) Explanations are not only unnecessary, but even harmful at the start, and, later, they are better given in the language studied, for then you kill two birds with one stone. (2) Remember the fable of the hare and the tortoise. (3) They do not know what the kindergarten aims at; they forget that every lesson, from the primary school to the university, ought to be an object-lesson; and they overlook the fact that any man who is not deaf and dumb can learn a number of languages, while extremely few know how to teach one. Of course, it is desirable that the teacher should know the pupil's vernacular; not, how-

ever, in order to use it as a direct means of teaching, but rather so as to enable him better to appreciate the working of the pupil's mind and to modify the lesson to his needs. When you translate, be it only a little, you change the entire attitude of the student, and that little will soon grow to be the whole.

If, therefore, you cannot teach a language without translation, burn your books and learn a trade. Bricklayers earn from three to four dollars a day; farm hands and housemaids are scarce all over the country. To conclude by a parody of Danton's famous cry, three things are necessary to learn a language: Speak it, still speak it, always speak it.

But, one may say, our purpose is not to fit our students as waiters in a cosmopolitan restaurant or as guides for Cook & Co. We are treating the matter from an educational point of view and in an academic way. Our business is to train the mind by the wholesome gymnastics of grammar and to adorn it with the gems of literature. For that a reading knowledge is sufficient. We are not a mere school of languages.

Of course, you are not; you are considerably less, and your pretended drill of the mind is farcical. Do you train your body with treatises on calisthenics or the history of sports? And what will be the moral effect if later the student discovers that he has not learned what he had a right to expect to be taught; or what if, in his youthful naïveté, he takes his achievement in linguistic studies as a standard of efficiency in other branches? As for literature, it is beyond your reach. The only gate to literature is the language, and that gate is locked to you.

Suppose even that a reading knowledge, in certain cases, were sufficient. Even then it remains true that the shortest way to enable a student to read a language is to make him speak it.

If the form is faulty or inelegant, there is ample occasion for the teacher to inform, to correct, and to polish; to give incidentally and profitably the whole body of grammar in its didactic function and based upon something real. To teach grammar differently is to lose time, and to pretend to teach the language through grammar is worse, for it is dishonest as to sell oleomargarine under the name of butter. Simple every-day experiences

come first, but will soon be exhausted, and at that point the question arises what next to talk about, or, better, what subject or subjects to use as material for the further study and constant practice of the language. Literature, philology, and history, all closely related to language, lend themselves particularly to this use, and can easily be made vehicles of language study. In fact, they need not be clearly separated from it and from each other; the measure in which each enters into the lesson must be determined according to the maturity of the student, his taste and purpose. In general, and especially for children, history seems to be best suited. History is a series of stories, and, after all, to tell a story is the chief object of language. The most trivial experience, whether we will or not, is told in story form. Description is only a frame for the story, and lyric poetry is beyond the average student, as it is beyond the average individual. By history is not here meant a chronology of kings and presidents, nor a list of battles and of treaties. It is the revival of the past of a people in its national and social life as well as in its political career. Language, literature, art, institutions, are all logical outcomes of that past, and are intelligently studied only in the light of history. In a sense, it is correct to say that history is a more valuable auxiliary to language study than literature, which latter need not be neglected, and will in its turn profit by the study of history. Any great work is so only on condition that it is a synthetic expression of the time in which it was produced, and, it being such, he who would see its full meaning must have a clear idea of its time. Otherwise these masterpieces lose their bearing, become meaningless and even grotesque, like a madonna in a machine shop or the Parthenon marbles in the British Museum. It is madness to expect American boys and girls of the twentieth century to admire or even to understand Corneille without first, through history, learning to know why the great playwright is justly called the "sublime Corneille."

This selection of material for language study might help to solve another problem of the present school system; the relief of the program of studies. It is, indeed, a serious question how to

make room for all the subjects which our complex modern life makes it desirable for schools and colleges to teach. Our interests and knowledge are constantly increasing, while our lives are as short as were those of our forefathers. Days now have, as of old, only twenty-four hours, and there is no prospect of lengthening them. Each generation, each year, adds to the curriculum, with the result that from every country comes a cry for relief. Yet none dares to take the initiative, and the truth is that our programs are overburdened to a perilous extent. Improved methods have done and are doing much for the balance of school economy, but there is a limit to that remedy, and even now, the difficulty is greater than it has ever been. Could not some further relief be found through language study? Could the teaching of languages not be linked to such subjects as arithmetic, geography, physics, etc., etc.? In France the study of the mother-tongue is practically combined with all other studies. Each teacher is, at the same time he instructs in his own subject, a teacher of French. The results are excellent, and it would perhaps be worth while in this country to take the hint and thus remove the just cause of complaint against the wretched English used by school children and by college students. And why could not the same expedient be successfully adopted in connection with foreign languages?

MAXIME INGRES.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE TEACHING OF FRENCH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

THE discussion of modern-language teaching which for two decades has been carried on across the water with such intensity has failed to arouse a corresponding interest on this side of the Atlantic. The demand for greater attention to physical science has met with general approval and ready response; new courses have been introduced, old ones lengthened, laboratories built and filled with costly apparatus, additional teachers employed. What recognition, meanwhile, has been given the modern-language movement, of which J. J. Findlay¹ says:

Quite deliberately the present author ventures to assert that the "reform" in modern language teaching now in progress is one of the most noteworthy events in the sphere of teaching since the Renaissance, surpassing in importance even the results of introducing science to the schools.

What share have American authors in the 720 *theoretischen Erörterungen* catalogued by Breymann² for the eighteen years from 1881 to 1898 inclusive? Hardly more than the odd twenty. The reason for this comparative neglect of modern language instruction lies largely in our remoteness from non-English-speaking peoples. Hence ability to read the foreign language has been our almost exclusive aim, and ability to read has come to mean merely the ability to turn into more or less slovenly English an approximation to the thought of the original. So remote even is the required approximation that clever boys have been known to "cram" French enough in six weeks to pass the entrance examination for reputable colleges. Naturally, then, some have considered a single year long enough to allow for so easy a subject. Such conditions tend to perpetuate themselves, for teachers thus trained cannot in general impart what they do not possess, that is, an all-around command of a foreign language, and a broad view of what it should stand for in education.

¹*Principles of Class Teaching* (Macmillan & Co.).

²H. BREYMANN, *Die neu sprachliche Reform-Literatur* (Leipzig: G. Böhme, 1895 and 1900).

The membership of the Modern Language Association of America is composed largely of college men, and it deals with problems of advanced scholarship rather than with the elementary work of secondary schools. In 1897-98, however, a committee of twelve, appointed by the association, made a careful study of the teaching of modern languages and submitted a report that has been widely circulated. A New England Modern Language Association has just been organized with the purpose of uniting modern language teachers throughout the section in an effort to bring school and college together, and to make the instruction in modern languages as effective as possible. In answer to a question concerning the work of this association, the head of a department in Harvard University recently wrote:

I should prefer to have questions about the teaching of modern languages in the schools considered on the basis (1) of the primary function which the schools have to fulfil, namely, to meet the needs of the great mass of pupils who do not go to college; and (2) of bringing the requirements of the colleges into harmony with this function.

Assuming that French is the first language, and that a competent teacher finds himself in charge of a class of thirty-five to forty beginners just entering the high school, how shall he teach them on such a basis?

For the first year, let his aim be the general development of his pupils along the lines of ultimate linguistic power. "*Bedenkt, ihr habet weiches Holz zu spalten,*" must be his watchword. Both as a proper foundation for future work, and to meet a crying need of every pupil in the class, general educational aims, rather than extensive knowledge of French, should be his object. These aims are: (1) promptness and accuracy of ear and eye; (2) flexibility and control of the vocal organs; (3) feeling for the logical structure and necessary connectedness of the sentence; (4) fundamental habits of agreement and word-order; (5) familiarity with common grammatical terms. As incidental to these ends, and as a means of obtaining them, a small vocabulary of common words and expressions should be thoroughly mastered, and a hundred pages, more or less, of the easiest French read in class.

From the beginning the pupil must realize certain facts: (1) that French was first spoken and then written; (2) that real language is swift; (3) that an answer must be right the first time to count; (4) that nine-tenths right is all wrong; (5) that all the work is for one pupil, and each boy must feel himself to be the one.

A class of beginners reminds one somewhat of a litter of young puppies. They cannot hear—distinctions of open and closed, long and short, voiced and unvoiced, are lost upon them; they cannot see—two or three letters omitted, inserted, changed or transposed are quite immaterial; they cannot control their muscles—and the queerest sounds and grimaces result from the best intentions. Whether a different study of English in the lower grades would give us creatures that possess themselves to a greater extent is a question that we can only hint at here. The limitations are real, however, and as accurate imitation is essential in early language work, the pupil must learn first of all to hear, see, and reproduce. In this a vast amount of chorus work, repeating in unison after the teacher or a comrade, is of the greatest value in large classes. Such work may properly be considered as a gymnastic or a musical exercise, in which any marked individual deviation from the standard is readily noticed and located. Questions should be so brief and definite that a prompt, correct answer may fairly be expected from the pupil called, and instantly repeated by the class at the sign from the teacher.

The first work should be phonetic; the vowel sounds explained and produced. In this the "vowel triangle" will be useful. The formation of nasal vowels is explained, with the approximate correspondence of nasals to the non-nasal open vowels. Then come the sounds corresponding to certain consonant graphs. Drill on the sounds separately and in common words that are spoken, repeated, associated with thought, written by the teacher and copied by the pupils, then pronounced again. Ear, tongue, and eye must be trained together, and their impressions associated with thought as closely and permanently as possible. In securing this thought English may properly be used, as well as

in explanations. Sweet¹ puts the matter in a nutshell when he says:

As long as we are learning the foreign language, it is our first business to have it explained to us as clearly and unambiguously as possible. Therefore all explanations ought to be in the language we know—that is, our own—not in the one we do not know.

The Committee of Twelve is right, too, in saying:

Grammatical terms do not come under the head of "everyday forms of expression." The principal value of grammatical drill conducted in German is to teach the learner how to handle the sentence. So far as the vocabulary is concerned, he might better be learning something else.

Add to this that the English grammatical terms have a far greater value for the English-speaking pupil, who comes to the high school with little if any knowledge of their meaning, and who must learn them in the foreign language class if he is ever to know them. "The first preparation for the study of a foreign language is the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the peculiarities of one's own language," says Sweet. We may not entirely agree with this statement, but we must feel that the chief linguistic "need of the great mass of pupils" is English rather than French; and, with this in mind, I cannot say that my business is to teach French, and refuse to concern myself with English. A considerable amount of comparison and contrast aids in the intelligent comprehension of both languages.

For months the utmost care must be given to pronunciation; for if not learned well at first, it generally never will be. Every word and phrase should be drilled upon orally in class before being assigned for home study. The use of a phonetic text would perhaps make it possible to assign home work with less danger of acquiring wrong habits of pronunciation; but even in Germany most teachers probably do not advise a phonetic text, and with our time limitations it does not seem well to extend the use of phonetic characters beyond their application to words or word-groups in grammars and dictionaries.

By the end of the first year we should have attained to a considerable degree our first objects—training of the organs,

¹ H. SWEET, *The Practical Study of Languages*. N. Y.: Henry Holt, 1900.

and correct fundamental speech-habits—with a well-digested vocabulary of the most common terms, thoroughness being considered of greater importance than extent.

As compared with the work outlined for the first year in the report of the Committee of Twelve, the amount read in class will probably be rather less than more than the minimum suggestion of 100 pages, but this should be supplemented by encouraging outside reading of easy stories. Most of the better pupils may be led to take an interest in this, and the habit of reading French for one's own pleasure is the best guarantee that the power once acquired will not be lost.

With the beginning of the second year our special aims—power to use the foreign language, and a sympathetic knowledge of the life, customs, and literature of the foreign people—assume greater prominence.

What Sweet says of grammatical analysis—that it has two stages, one of recognition, or identification, and another of reproduction or construction—is true of other features of language work. Most of the matter attacked during the first year is so essential that it must be carried to the second stage, and one cannot be said to know the language at all until these elements are mastered. The great mass of vocabulary, idioms, and less usual constructions is, however, by no means essential to a good knowledge of French, and to a satisfactory feeling that one is able to cope with most that he is likely to find. With a little help from the dictionary and a little wit, one easily discovers the meaning of new expressions as they arise, and can get along very well, just as the child does in his own language, until frequent repetition fixes gradually in the memory what is most useful. In behalf of greater variety and interest, progress may therefore become more rapid. Only the more important expressions and constructions need be dwelt upon.

The elements of grammar should be studied in a systematic way during the second year, and a text-book for this purpose is advisable. Writing in French, which has hitherto consisted of the writing of paradigms, dictation exercises, and very close imitations of portions of the French text studied, assumes the

form of a somewhat freer paraphrasing. The reading matter remains the center of the instruction; and before translation is attempted, the thought of the original should be brought out by question and answer, by paraphrasing and explanations in French, thus furnishing abundant oral drill. Giving abstracts in French is good for those pupils who can do it well without too great expenditure of time, but is apt to drag, to give too much time to a single pupil, and thus degenerate into an individual rather than a class exercise.

Translation must be an idiomatic rendering of thought, and not a mechanical substitution of English words for French ones. It is exceedingly difficult to secure this. Where sentences are short, it may be done by letting the teacher give the French sentence, the pupil, with book closed, translating into English. With more complicated sentences, the pupil may be asked to read the French aloud himself, and then, with book closed, to give in English the substance of what he has read; finally, with book open, attempting the finished translation. Pupils should be taught to simplify such sentences in a first reading by rejecting or skimming over all nonessentials—adjective, adverbial, and parenthetical expressions—until the bare skeleton of subject, verb, and simplest complements stand out clearly. Careful attention to punctuation and connectives will usually make this easy. Then the bones may be clothed with flesh until the original sentence appears with all its parts in proper proportion. English should never be accepted until it is correct, appropriate, and expressive.

Here, as in the first year, I should advise reading in class rather less than is recommended by the Committee of Twelve, in order to give plenty of oral work, dictation, paraphrasing, careful grammatical explanation of essentials, etc. The more interested pupils may be led to read largely out of class, sometimes as much as a book a week. This reading is rapid, with little use of dictionary, but in an enjoyable way enlarges vocabulary, develops linguistic feeling and judgment, and gives the power to seize quickly the main thought of a passage.

Probably easy narration is the most effective reading matter.

American pupils do not manifest much enthusiasm for large doses of *Realien* or description; and the selections of Beyer and Passy would strike most young Americans as rather tame. Our texts are apt to be too difficult both in form and thought. The Committee of Twelve says: "Teachers should not be in too great haste to get to reading good literature." The Germans defer such reading until the third or fourth year of study, and leave until the sixth to ninth years books that American schools take not infrequently in the second, and in rare cases in the first year of French. For the best work with second-year pupils I should be glad to read nothing harder than Malot's *Sans Famille*, while for third-year work Verne, Dumas, Mérimée, etc., are about right in point of difficulty. Add an easy comedy and a little history, say Thiers' *Expédition de Bonaparte en Égypte*, or Ségur's *Retraite de Moscou*, and the third year will be complete. By this time English may be heard only in an occasional explanation and translation, and during the second and third years much time may be saved by having a large part of the translating done by the teacher. Thirty-nine of your forty boys ought to be profiting more by it than they would if the fortieth were doing the translating.

Add a fourth year for history of a harder sort and for real literature, and we shall have a well-rounded course, if five periods per week be given the first year, and not less than four thereafter.

And now the cry goes up: "Not a high school in the country gives seventeen week-hours to French!" "I must fit in one year for 'Tech,' and in two for the Harvard advanced examination!" Precisely; and the conclusion is simply this: the secondary schools cannot give a strong, well-rounded course in French, and all the other things they are attempting, to any one pupil. But we have been planning the kind of course that shall educate a boy; that with neither dawdling nor hurry shall train eye and ear and tongue; that shall make certain principles of language and logic a part of himself; that shall show him the real meaning and use of grammar; that shall improve his English; and that shall finally send him out with a knowledge of French that will stay by him, making it a pleasure to read a French book,

and a possibility to carry on a simple conversation in French or to get the substance of a clearly delivered French speech. Less than that should not be done if French is to be studied at all. If a boy is to stop short of this, he had better let French alone and put his time into studying his own language.

But why say that we cannot have time enough to learn one foreign language with some thoroughness, when high-school pupils are studying four? Without discussing the question whether a competent teacher of French could not take the time now assigned to English grammar in the two grades below the high school, and in it teach a year's work of French and more English than the pupils get now, let us ask simply whether the boy who knows something of one language is not better educated than his neighbor who knows nothing of four; nothing, that is, which makes any of the four of use to him even for reading, or leaves any of the four as a permanent acquisition. My pupils who enter Harvard give thirty-four week-hours to the preparation of Latin, German, and French. I believe that if this time were devoted entirely to either Latin and German or French and German, the school, its graduates, and the college would all be better off.

This brings us to the second topic suggested by my Harvard friend, namely, bringing the requirements of the colleges into harmony with the primary function of the schools.

Most candidates take entrance examinations in four languages, yet the cry of unsatisfactory language work is universal. Has it occurred to anyone that the remedy may lie in better work in fewer dialects? In the interest of a better and more symmetrical education in the high schools, let the colleges refuse to accept more than two foreign languages in entrance examinations, and let proficiency in these be properly tested and rewarded. To the Harvard two-point credit for elementary French add an oral requirement with a two-point credit, so that the four points now given for advanced French, which means in most cases an entirely one-sided development along the lines of translation and composition, might be given instead for a symmetrical knowledge of the language, including a good understanding of elementary gram-

mar, the ability to translate simple French into good English, to read French aloud intelligibly, to write French from dictation, to write in French an abstract of a short, easy story read aloud at the examination. Two points additional for more difficult translation and composition, and the same treatment of German, would make it possible to get twelve points for good work in any two of the four languages usually offered. Including English, this gives to languages sixteen out of twenty-six points. With the present importance of mathematics, science, and history, to say nothing of music and art, would not a larger proportion be monstrous?

Giving to two foreign languages the time now divided among three gives to each the seventeen week-hours already asked for a satisfactory course. Unless, however, the colleges will move in the matter, the schools can do but little; for it is a fact that if 10 per cent. of the pupils in a class are heading for college, the instruction will follow the lines of work demanded for the college examination, and the 90 per cent. must get what they can out of it.

Meanwhile, most teachers of French have little option what to do or how to do it. A fence of translation, grammar, and composition stands before them; they are allowed the least possible time in which to train pupils to leap over it; and their success is measured by the proportion of their pupils who land on the other side. This process is commonly called education.

Modern-language teachers in this country need to awake, to discuss, to organize, to make known the difference between good work and poor, to demand what we must have in order to do the former. We must show plainly that French, properly studied, is neither easy or superficial, nor lacking, as an educational subject, in either discipline or culture. And we must likewise emphasize that to teach it in this way takes time and that the French-in-twenty-lessons charlatans have no place among educators.

WILLIAM B. SNOW.

ENGLISH HIGH SCHOOL,
Boston, Mass.

THE TEACHING OF FRENCH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

EVER since the time of Montaigne, who learned Latin by what we would now call the "Natural Method," the question of teaching foreign languages has remained open and "*Adhuc sub judice lis est.*" The great essayist tells us:

Mon père me donna en charge à un Allemand du tout ignorant de notre langue et très bien versé dans la latine. Cettuycy, qu'il avait fait venir exprez, et qui estoit bien chèrement gagé, m'avoit continuellement entre les bras. . . . C'est merveille du fruit que chascun y feit: mon père et ma mère y apprirent assez de latin pour l'entendre, et en acquirent à suffisance pour s'en servir à la nécessité, comme feirent aussi les domestiques qui estoient plus attachez à mon service.

Sure enough, this unsolved problem remained dormant for many years, but it sprang up again in the sixties, when Professor Hennessy opened his school in New Haven, and is still confronting us.

In our public high schools, out of a freshman class of one hundred, only 3 per cent. go to college.¹ The high-school teacher in planning his course of study must therefore consider it as an aim, not as a means to further progress. Given a four-year course in French, four periods of forty-five or fifty minutes a week—*i. e.*, about four hundred and seventy hours all told—with classes of from twenty five to forty pupils ranging in age from fourteen to twenty, the questions that present themselves are: What can be accomplished? How should the work be done? A general development of the pupil should primarily be the aim. One should try to develop him, not only mentally, but also physically. The senses—*viz.*, hearing, seeing, and a proper use of the vocal organs—as well as the silent faculties—*viz.*, intelligence, reasoning, and memory—should be taken into consideration. To develop the senses, correct pronunciation should be very much insisted upon. But how should pronunciation be

¹ Figures for 1900 furnished by the Bureau of Education, Washington. Since then this low percentage has still somewhat decreased.

mar, the ability to translate simple French into good English, to read French aloud intelligibly, to write French from dictation, to write in French an abstract of a short, easy story read aloud at the examination. Two points additional for more difficult translation and composition, and the same treatment of German, would make it possible to get twelve points for good work in any two of the four languages usually offered. Including English, this gives to languages sixteen out of twenty-six points. With the present importance of mathematics, science, and history, to say nothing of music and art, would not a larger proportion be monstrous?

Giving to two foreign languages the time now divided among three gives to each the seventeen week-hours already asked for a satisfactory course. Unless, however, the colleges will move in the matter, the schools can do but little; for it is a fact that if 10 per cent. of the pupils in a class are heading for college, the instruction will follow the lines of work demanded for the college examination, and the 90 per cent. must get what they can out of it.

Meanwhile, most teachers of French have little option what to do or how to do it. A fence of translation, grammar, and composition stands before them; they are allowed the least possible time in which to train pupils to leap over it; and their success is measured by the proportion of their pupils who land on the other side. This process is commonly called education.

Modern-language teachers in this country need to awake, to discuss, to organize, to make known the difference between good work and poor, to demand what we must have in order to do the former. We must show plainly that French, properly studied, is neither easy or superficial, nor lacking, as an educational subject, in either discipline or culture. And we must likewise emphasize that to teach it in this way takes time and that the French-in-twenty-lessons charlatans have no place among educators.

WILLIAM B. SNOW.

ENGLISH HIGH SCHOOL,
Boston, Mass.

THE TEACHING OF FRENCH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

EVER since the time of Montaigne, who learned Latin by what we would now call the "Natural Method," the question of teaching foreign languages has remained open and "*Adhuc sub iudice lis est.*" The great essayist tells us:

Mon père me donna en charge à un Allemand du tout ignorant de notre langue et très bien versé dans la latine. Cettuycy, qu'il avait fait venir exprez, et qui estoit bien chèrement gagé, m'avoit continuellement entre les bras. . . . C'est merveille du fruit que chacun y fait: mon père et ma mère y apprirent assez de latin pour l'entendre, et en acquirent à suffisance pour s'en servir à la nécessité, comme feirent aussi les domestiques qui estoient plus attachez à mon service.

Sure enough, this unsolved problem remained dormant for many years, but it sprang up again in the sixties, when Professor Hennessy opened his school in New Haven, and is still confronting us.

In our public high schools, out of a freshman class of one hundred, only 3 per cent. go to college.¹ The high-school teacher in planning his course of study must therefore consider it as an aim, not as a means to further progress. Given a four-year course in French, four periods of forty-five or fifty minutes a week—*i. e.*, about four hundred and seventy hours all told—with classes of from twenty five to forty pupils ranging in age from fourteen to twenty, the questions that present themselves are: What can be accomplished? How should the work be done? A general development of the pupil should primarily be the aim. One should try to develop him, not only mentally, but also physically. The senses—*viz.*, hearing, seeing, and a proper use of the vocal organs—as well as the silent faculties—*viz.*, intelligence, reasoning, and memory—should be taken into consideration. To develop the senses, correct pronunciation should be very much insisted upon. But how should pronunciation be

¹ Figures for 1900 furnished by the Bureau of Education, Washington. Since then this low percentage has still somewhat decreased.

taught? By phonetics, imitation, or consonance; *i. e.*, by a comparison of English and French vocal sounds?

Pronunciation.—In order to acquire a fairly good pronunciation a pupil must have the two following physical faculties: first, sensitiveness of the ear; second, flexibility of the vocal organs. If both or even one of these be missing, no matter how hard the teacher tries, no matter what method he uses, he never will attain any satisfactory result; it would be just as easy to try to show the different hues of the rainbow to a color-blind person.

Theoretically the phonetic method is well and good; but in practice, although it may do very well in college, it is absolutely unavailing in a high-school course, the main objection being the difficulty met with in mastering the phonetic notation. And to be frank, the writer has his doubts as to the real value of this science, inasmuch as some of the best phoneticians he has met were very deficient in the pronunciation of foreign languages; it was, indeed, a case of "*medice, cura te ipsum.*"

After all, imitation will probably give the most satisfactory results, if the sounds are methodically grouped. If, for instance, the many combinations giving the French nasal *an* are grouped together, and if the pupils are told that when one or even two consonants are found after the characteristic letters of the sound, they do not affect the pronunciation in the least, such a statement will greatly facilitate the pupil's work. It would also be a help to him should he be told how to use his vocal organs in order to produce the sound he wishes to utter. Consonance—and by this is meant the resemblance that exists between French and English sounds—may also be used to some advantage. Scientifically speaking, there is probably not a single sound found in the English language that is also found in French, but quite often they come near enough to one another to be indiscriminately used.

Acquiring a vocabulary.—To acquire a vocabulary much reading must be done, and, moreover, the reading matter ought to be changed at least every ten weeks. A class which at first finds it difficult to translate two pages of a text will easily take twice as much after three weeks, and at the end of the ten weeks will read the text without any recourse to the vocabulary. The reason

for this is obvious: the number of words used by every individual writer is not, as a rule, very large, exception being made, of course, for such writers as Balzac, Hugo, and Flaubert, who, by the way, are but seldom taken up in high school. In a short time the pupil, having unconsciously mastered the vocabulary used by the writer, can, therefore increase his vocabulary but little by continuing to read the same author. It is in consequence of the principle just explained that collections of short stories by different writers have proven useful in the class-room. Moreover, the frequent changing of reading matter keeps the student's interest awake—a point never to be overlooked in teaching. Great care should be taken that idiomatic English be used. It is very poor policy to translate good French into bad English, for the pupil gets into the habit of using ungrammatical language, and in time does not know whether he is speaking correctly or not.

Memorizing.—Memorizing prose passages is also useful, provided that a practical use be made of it either by using the memorized lines for a topic of conversation, or for translation from memory into idiomatic English. Memory work is only good as far as it helps in some other work, for, as Montaigne says: "Sçavoir par cœur n'est pas sçavoir; c'est tenir ce qu'on a donné en garde à sa mémoire."

Composition.—As a means of deeply impressing upon young minds the construction of a foreign tongue, nothing is better than translation from English into the language that is being studied. At the beginning of the work, sentences should be very easy, in order that the pupil may not have to contend with too many difficulties—a point seldom considered by the numerous composition books that are on the market. A good plan is to allow the pupils to exchange papers before the work is corrected in the class-room, each signing the paper he corrects. Sentences should be read in the foreign language only, and then spelled out. The teacher may then demand a fair copy of the work after the pupils' own papers have been returned to them.

Dictation.—This is one of the most useful exercises. It ought to be practiced once a week. There is nothing in the teaching

of French that produces quicker or better results. It trains the pupil's ear, and if grammatical explanations are clearly given while corrections are being made, it will go farther than any book in the teaching of grammar, especially if the blackboard is freely used. The dictations should not be taken from a book, but should be made up of the words met with in the Reader. The construction of the sentences should be changed, different verb-forms should be used, but not many new words should be introduced, especially in elementary classes, unless their meaning can be easily grasped, for dictating to pupils words which they cannot understand is much worse than no dictation at all.

Use of the foreign language in the class-room.—As far as possible, the foreign language should be used in the class-room. Professor H. C. G. von Jagemann says :

His [the pupil's] ultimate aim, to be sure, should be to understand and use the foreign language without the intervention of his own, *i. e.*, without translating.¹

Commenting on what he considers to be faulty methods of teaching German he adds :

Aside from the reading of the German text, and even that is not always done, the student hears and speaks nothing but English ; in other words, for about ten minutes out of possible fifty, he learns German, the remaining forty minutes he learns facts about German.

These remarks apply as well to French or Spanish.

Professor C. H. Grandgent in a paper read at a meeting of the Massachusetts Association of Classical and High-School Teachers, December, 1891, says :

There are at least four reasons why we should cultivate it [conversation] : in the first place, it satisfies a frequently expressed desire on the part of the public, and as the public supports the schools, its wishes should be heeded ; secondly, classes do not correctly appreciate what they read (especially if their text is either metrical in form or colloquial in style) unless they know how it sounds ; thirdly, the actual use of the foreign tongue invariably interests the pupils, giving them a sense of mastery that nothing else can bring ; and, lastly, exercises of this kind stimulate the teacher to more extended study and greater mental activity. I should say, therefore, to those instructors who have a practical command of the language they teach : Use it

¹ *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. I, pp. 220 ff.

as much as possible in school, but do not waste time on it. If you have something to tell to the class, say it in the foreign tongue whenever you think you will be understood without long explanation or tiresome repetitions. Encourage the scholars to express themselves in the same language as soon and as often as they can. Always, and particularly at the outset, insist on the best pronunciation attainable. Begin, as a rule, with simple and not too numerous French or German sentences containing no new words, and decrease, month by month, the proportion of English spoken. You will find that during the last year the greater part of your instruction can be imparted in the language you are teaching.

Moreover, if the high-school course is an aim in itself, not a preparation for college, the pupils should be taught, as far as possible, a practical use of the language without leaving out the mental discipline that is thought by many to be the sole goal of modern-language teaching. A further object to be desired is, of course, an appreciation of French literature, but it must be admitted that to most high-school pupils the beauty of it remains a sealed book, even after four years of faithful and steady work. They are either unprepared or too immature to appreciate it.

From a practical point of view, what then can be accomplished in a four-year course? After many years of experience, it is the writer's opinion that results may be summed up as follows: 12 or 15 per cent. of the pupils succeed in writing and speaking the language fairly well, *i. e.*, well enough for practical use; as many more succeed in speaking and writing it after a fashion; 50 per cent. more understand it when not too rapidly spoken, but are unable either to speak or to write it with any degree of correctness; the rest have just been wasting their time and the teacher's energy.

Such a meager result, it may be objected, is hardly worth trying for. True enough, but are results any better in ancient languages, or in any branch of study? How many high-school pupils are able, when they get through their course, to write a Latin composition worth looking at? How many have mastered even the rudiments of geometry? How many could give a correct account of the most important events in Ancient, Greek, or Roman history? How many have learned to write their own language correctly? This comparative lack of good

results does not prove that more could have been accomplished by an exclusively translation method. On the contrary, it has been the writer's experience that of his students who entered college those who had learned to read aloud correctly, and to speak the language to a certain extent, stood higher than those who had used the translation method alone.

A further result of the use of French in the class-room is to quicken the thinking power of the pupils. When a pupil is required to answer in French, he has at the same moment to think of the construction, the agreement of words, and the pronunciation, as well as of what he wishes to say, and it is obvious that, in order to do all this, quick thinking is necessary. Moreover, the clearness and the precision of the French sentence give to his mind a training that is akin to that given by mathematics. "*Ce qui n'est pas clair n'est pas français*" has remained true up to this day, and a mastery of spoken French does much toward enabling the pupil to express himself clearly in his own language.

Nor is this all. The use of the foreign language by the pupils develops in them that very important quality self-confidence. Indeed, one of the greatest difficulties a teacher has to overcome is the pupil's natural timidity, his fear of ridicule. It takes some time for him to conquer the bashfulness he feels in trying to express himself in French before his schoolmates and to brave the possible laughter that his deficient pronunciation may cause. But if a pupil can be made to stand before the class and read with complete self-control a paragraph or two; or, better still, if he can be made, not only to answer questions, but to ask them, much has been gained toward the general development, which is, above and before all, the aim of a high-school education, to say nothing of his increased knowledge of French. To reach such a result, a student must, at every minute, feel the encouraging influence of his teacher; a rapid glance, an expression of approval on the instructor's face, will do much to give him courage in a work that is really more arduous than most of us realize it to be.

And, last but not least, the use of the foreign language in the

class-room often awakens in young minds a desire for a further study of the language—a desire which never would have been awakened if only the dead side of the language had been shown to them. It is for many the starting-point to a thorough mastery of the language. How many times it has been my good fortune to meet army or navy officers, lawyers, even business men, who on meeting me long after leaving school were able to converse in French, and were so kind as to say that my compelling them to use the foreign language in the class-room had been the entering wedge, and that ever since they had delighted in the keeping up of the acquired foreign language, and in trying to grow more fluent in it by reading and by associating with persons who spoke it.

In conclusion, it may perhaps be said that the practical knowledge of a foreign tongue, although it may be far from perfect, is an attainment devoutly to be wished, because, as the German proverb says: "So viele Sprachen jemand spricht, so oft ist er ein Mensch."

C. FONTAINE.

THE HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE,
New York City.

THE TEACHING OF FRENCH.

THE reading of Mr. Lawrence C. Hull's valuable paper on Latin¹ has so repeatedly made me exclaim, "Such are my sentiments concerning the study of modern languages," that I must beg leave to borrow his words over and over again in my attempt to bring due consideration to bear upon the vital importance of certain points in the teaching of modern languages. Improvement in that direction being already under fair way in German, I shall confine my remarks to the Romance languages in general, and to French in particular.

If, for instance, one takes up any French reader prepared for the benefit of first-, second-, and even third-year school or college students, he will invariably find it provided with so complete a vocabulary that not one word in the text has escaped, and even the same word is repeated as many times as it appears differently inflected in the text. Compilers, publishers, teachers, and students seem to believe that the larger the vocabulary and the more numerous the notes, the better the book. Now, I believe that both vocabulary and notes are just the great blemish in it.

To be able to appreciate this statement, a teacher must have tried readers altogether devoid of vocabulary, beginning with the simplest of texts, leading his pupils to recognize cognates, and himself supplying the rest. Then he will know how much more quickly and effectively students learn to translate anything at sight, how much stronger is their hold on the new language, how much more forcible, easy, fluent is their rendering of it into English, and how much better, healthier, and more durable are the results obtained by bringing into play the observing and reasoning powers of students, than by appealing to mere parrot memory.

When they have discovered, after a few lines of translation,

¹"The Mastery of English by the Study of Latin," *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. XI, pp. 665-776.

the near relation of the French prefixes *a-*, *de-*, *re-*, *pre-*, etc., with the same in English, and that of *-oire*, *-aire*, *-eur*, *-ier*, *-er*, etc., with *-ory*, *-ary*, *-or*, *-er*, etc.; also that of various consonants, as *b* and *p*, with *v* and *f*, and *vice versa*; and how the Latin or old French, consequently Norman English, *l* after a vowel has collapsed into *u*, and *s* into an accent, mostly circumflex, but often also an acute or grave, as well as *d*, *p*, *t*, etc., after *e*; when they have discovered these, and a few other things the unfolding of which they watch with intense interest, the students realize how comparatively few words and phrases for the English scholar there really are in French, the meaning of which cannot be detected by a bit of hard thinking.

Compare this sort of *jeu d'esprit* with the humdrum mechanical process of listlessly turning at every word to the vocabulary to find, for instance (I copy from some of the high standard readers for schools and colleges), that *trente* is "thirty;" *trente-trois* is "thirty-three," and *trois* is "three." Turning to *quarante-quatre*, I find the following: *quarante* is "forty," *quarante-quatre* is "forty-four," *quatre* is "four," etc., etc.

But let me begin with the letter *a* in the vocabulary of a textbook enjoying an unparalleled popularity, and follow down its columns, for curiosity's sake:

FRENCH	ENGLISH
abandonner	to abandon, forsake
abondance	abundance
abondamment	abundantly
abondant	abundant
absorber	to absorb
absurde	absurd
abuser	to abuse, to make a bad use of
académique	academic
accent	accent, tone
accepter	to accept
accident	accident, incident
acclimater	to acclimatize
accompagner	to accompany
accoupler	to couple, fasten
accoutumer	to accustom, habituate
accuser	to accuse, blame, reproach

FRENCH	ENGLISH
acteur	actor
action	action
actuellement	now, at this very time
addition	addition; also: bill, reckoning
adjurer	to adjure, beseech
admettre	to admit
admirer	to admire
admirablement	admirably
adresse	address, skill
adresser	to address
adversaire	adversary, opponent

As for the notes, I see, for instance, that I am referred to one after the phrase *âgé de dix ans*. The "Vocabulary" tells me that *âgé* is "aged," *de* is "of," *dix* is "ten," and *an* is "year;" and the "Notes," that *âgé de dix ans* means "ten years old." Now, really, is there in all the secondary schools and colleges of these broad United States one boy or girl who could not be trusted to find that out for himself, considering the aforesaid wonderfully complete "Vocabulary," the subject of the text, the context, the analogy, and the probabilities? A student should be left to discover for himself the English for *féminin*, for example, and *précieux*, *hôte*, *amitié*, *appartenir*, *brèche*, *compagnie*, *villageois*, *poulet*, etc., etc., and be led into recognizing even such distant cousins as *institutrice*, *maigreux*, *manchette*, *apporter*, *pâtissier*, *belle-mère*, *tuilerie*, *voisinage*, etc.; also into finding, to a nicety, the exact shade of their meaning in the sentence under study.

The maze of numberless so-called idioms can be unraveled by students through the same process. All they need is to be intelligently directed. The bit of mild mental gymnastics required for the puzzling out of such little problems in linguistics is just what makes the learning of languages worth the name of study.

And as to pronunciation, the poll-parrot method and systems of imitative phonetics now in vogue are, to use the happy expression of Mr. Hull's wise friend in Detroit, simply "immoral," and, moreover, foolish. Inasmuch as in all foreign languages "every single symbol of sound stands for that sound always,"

and enunciation is governed by immutable laws of syllabication, it is "wholesome" and meet for the young student to realize that "subordination to law is the condition of success;" that "there is no trifling" with the rules for the enunciation of vowels and consonants and for the dissection of words into articulated syllables; no allowance made for "hazy notions of the functions proper to every letter of the alphabet," and to every accent, apostrophe, diæresis, cedilla; no latitude whatever for "slovenly, slipshod" handling of any of those, not even if no larger than the finest needle's point. Indeed, especially of enunciation is it true that "what is not right is wrong;" and indeed it is good, wholesome, and refining educational discipline for the tongue and lips to be compelled to the scrupulous weighing and measuring of their slightest inflections, aware, as we are, of the fact that the minutest deviation from the right line will give us a church for a cherry, a white man for a wise one, poison for fish, a wheel for a street, a madman for a fire, an ass for a year, a cushion for a cousin, hunger for a wife, and so forth; making us, in short, unwittingly perform now the most comical and now the most tragical antics.

In face of these facts it is preposterous to expect from pupils anything approaching accuracy, and the merest show of interest in the enunciation of foreign languages, with the current systems of symbolic phonetics, or word or phrase sight-reading. The clearest fruitage of such systems is the utter confusion of logic and common-sense in the student. They form a most shaky foundation whereupon to build and balance, stone by stone, rafter by rafter, the so delicate and complicated fabric of a language. There can be no wholesome mental drill, no logical tracing from cause to effect, no practice in the exact application of rules, in the effort to assimilate in the mind's eye reality with symbol, as they are pictured, for instance, in the following (copied from an otherwise rather sensible and progressive manual):

oignon = ɔɲɔ̃

au printemps = o prɛ̃tã

j'ai eu = z-e-y

encre = ɑ̃:kr

champ = ʃɑ̃

conduire = kɔ̃:dkɥi:r

en haut = ā o	campagne = kōpaj̃
ensuite = āsyit	comment = kōmũ
heureux, se = ærø, ærøz	qui l'ont = ki lɔ
chemin de fer = ʃəmɛ̃ de fεr	gare = ga:r
crayon = krɛjɔ̃	beau, belle = bo
voici = vwasi	avec = avek
voilà = vwala	comme = kōm
montrez-moi = mōtre mwa	est = ε
agneau = aɟo	

First, it is evident that the few short, terse rules governing once for all the sounding of *an, am, en, em—on, om, ch; gn; ill*; hard and soft *g* and *c*, and a few others, constituting the whole science of French enunciation, can be learned a hundred times faster and to better purpose than the fanciful keys to those hieroglyphic symbols. And what is more, there is no truth in them. They do not approach anything like the true, accurate pronunciation; and they are the death of etymology, orthography, analogy, and of all the breadth and height and depth of the language. They make of it, in the mind's eye and on the tongue, an illiterate, shapeless, boorish, unlicked patois. They are ruthlessly murderous.

Another of their dire workings is to obliterate entirely the constant cause of hundreds of grammatical accidents—seemingly unaccountable, senseless accidents—making thus of a bulky, by far the most bulky, part of grammar an incongruous nondescript to be blindly committed to memory parrot-wise, to the better confusion of logic and common-sense. Meanwhile the *raison d'être* of almost every one of them is to be found in the utterly discarded alphabetic and syllabic code.

And the meter, rhythm, and rhyme of French verse—what becomes of them, tumbled as they are pell-mell into that chopping sea of alien waters called imitative phonetics? And what becomes of the sonorous, harmonious, and noble pace of classical prose, chiseled every line, every word of it, as if forever to be balanced before the world's audience on great actors' tongues? I defy the inventor of any phonetic system to measure with it the rhythm of a single stanza. The impossibility to do it is proof enough that there is no truth in the system. The nearest

approach to the true reading of a foreign language by means of imitative phonetics is as far from it as Mr. Dooley's English is from the king's English. And, allow me to repeat it, the true, good-for-always alphabetical and syllabical rules are learned in less time and with less work—very much less time and work—than any phonetical system.

MARIE-CAROLINE DUBY.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Columbus, Ohio.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

GEORGE HERBERT LOCKE.

IN his report of Harvard College, 1902-3, President Eliot makes a very interesting examination of the sources of the supply of the six hundred or more students who each year enter the various classes of that college. They come from public high schools, academies and other endowed schools, and private schools, some two hundred schools in all. The interesting question for us is the relative proportion of students going to Harvard from the public high schools as compared with the other schools, and the comparative success of these students at the admission examinations. The president reports that about 30 per cent. are from the high schools, and gives a table of percentages based on the records at the admission examinations of last June, of boys who came from schools which have sent at least one boy to Harvard College in each of the last three years. There were thirty-nine such high schools, of which twenty sent not more than two boys each into that college last June.

	Honors (Grade A or B) Per cent.	Unsatisfactory (Grade D) Per cent.	Failures (Grade E or F) Per cent.	Total No. of Answer Books
Public high schools.....	16	36	15	1,217
Academies and endowed schools.....	12	37	22	866
Private day schools.....	11	39	21	585

Such a table as this may not prove much, but it certainly is very suggestive as to the change that is rapidly taking place in the very section of the country that is most likely to resist that change. Here, in the stronghold of the academy and the private school, the public high school is winning its way and showing clearly that it can prepare students for Harvard College as well as—if not better than—these institutions which are supposed to have a monopoly of the education of the East. There could not be a more excellent illustration, for Harvard is one of the few colleges that holds tenaciously to its own system of examinations, and thus the work of the public high school is visibly increased, and it enters the field under a severe handicap.

A second table compares the results of the students from the two kinds of endowed schools—the academies, like Phillips Andover, or Phillips Exeter, and the boarding schools, like St. Mark's School or the Hotchkiss School—

and the boys from the academies did a little the better. Both sets of schools, however, were less successful than the public high schools.

A third method of comparison brought together the students from these schools when about to graduate from Harvard College, and the doctrine of the survival of the fittest had a chance to be considered. In June last, 172 men took the degree of bachelor of arts with distinction. Of these, 84 came to college from public high schools, 44 from academies and endowed schools, 33 from private schools, and 12 from other colleges.

The president concludes his examination by saying that these results show that the product of the public school has more character and power of work than the product of the other schools; that, while it is probably true that the public-school boy has stronger inducements to exert himself than the other boys have, yet that is one of his advantages which is likely to serve him well till maturity and beyond.

It certainly is encouraging to those who are identified with public-school work to have such testimony from the president of Harvard College, and, while we recognize the limitations of such an investigation we cannot ignore its significance.

ONE of the most useful publications of that useful educational department, the University of the State of New York, is the annual review of the

LEGISLATION
AFFECTING
HIGH SCHOOLS
DURING 1903

school legislation of the year compiled by Mr. James Russell Parsons, Jr. From that we are selecting the laws relating to secondary education as being of most interest to our readers. Colorado passed a law under which union high-school districts may be formed in fourth- and fifth-class counties; Minnesota and North Dakota framed provisions allowing adjacent school districts to combine for the support of a graded or high school; Wisconsin's joint-high-school act was so amended as to unite with a free-high-school district a town or village created within the territory of that district; South Dakota provided for establishing township high schools. California in 1902 passed a constitutional amendment by which a special state tax for high schools was levied, and last year the legislature authorized an annual tax of \$15 for each high-school pupil, two-thirds to be apportioned pro rata, the rest irrespective of the number of pupils; Florida aids two-year high schools by giving \$360 each for three years, four-year high schools \$600 each for three years; Minnesota adds one-half to its allowance of \$500 to high schools giving special instruction in certain branches; and North Dakota raises the annual apportionment for high schools from \$4,000 to \$10,000.

Connecticut provides that towns which support no high school shall pay for the transportation of students to accredited schools, the state repaying one-half, and further, that high schools in which non-resident students are instructed at the expense of the state must be approved by the state board of education. Maine provided for the payment of tuition, not to exceed \$30

a year for each pupil, by such towns, they being entitled to partial reimbursement by the state; New Hampshire limited to \$40 the annual sum which a town may pay for students attending high school outside its limits, and gave authority to contract with an approved academy within its limits for instruction; New York appropriated \$100,000 for the tuition of non-resident high-school pupils from districts not maintaining an academic department; Michigan empowered school districts to pay for tuition and transportation of pupils who have completed the eighth grade; South Dakota declared by law that academic students living in a district which supports no secondary school may attend such in a neighboring district at the expense of the home district.

ONE of the most significant occurrences in the history of education in this country is the completion of thirty-five years of active service on the part of Charles W. Eliot as president of Harvard University. Called to this responsible position at the age of thirty-five, the celebration of his seventieth birthday marks a very interesting division of his life. On this occasion a letter was sent him, signed by ten thousand Harvard men, expressing in admirable terms the sentiments, not only of men of Harvard, but also of all persons in the United States who have an interest in the work of education. We cannot express better our estimate of his influence than by reproducing the letter.

THE CELEBRATION
OF THE SEVENTIETH
BIRTHDAY OF
PRESIDENT CHARLES
W. ELIOT OF
HARVARD
UNIVERSITY.

Dear Mr. President:

As with undiminished power you pass the age of seventy, we greet you.

Thirty-five years ago you were called to be president of Harvard College. At the age of thirty-five you became the head of an institution whose history was long, whose traditions were firm, and whose leading counselors were of twice your age. With prophetic insight you anticipated the movements of thought and life; your face was toward the coming day. In your imagination the college was already the university.

You have upheld the old studies and uplifted the new. You have given a new definition to a liberal education. The university has become the expression of the highest intellectual forces of the present as well as of the past.

You have held from the first that teacher and student alike grow strong through freedom. Working eagerly with you and for you are men whose beliefs, whether in education or in religion, differ widely from your own, yet who know that in speaking out their beliefs they are not more loyal to themselves than to you. By your faith in a young man's use of intellectual and spiritual freedom you have given new dignity to the life of the college student.

The universities and colleges throughout the land, though some are slow to accept your principles and adopt your methods, all feel your power and recognize with gratitude your stimulating influence and your leadership.

Through you the American people have begun to see that a university is not a cloister for the recluse, but an expression of all that is best in the nation's thought and character. From Harvard University men go into every part of our national life. To Harvard University come from the common schools, through paths that have been broadened by your work, the youth who have the capacity and the will to profit by her teaching. Your influence is felt in the councils of the teachers and in the education of the youngest child.

As a son of New England you have sustained the traditions of her patriots and scholars. By precept and example you have taught that the first duty of every citizen is to his country. In public life you have been independent and outspoken; in private life you have stood for simplicity. In the great and bewildering conflict of economic and social questions you have with clear head and firm voice spoken for the fundamental principles of democracy and the liberties of the people.

More precious to the sons of Harvard than your service as educator or citizen is your character. Your outward reserve has concealed a heart more tender than you have trusted yourself to reveal. Defeat of your cherished plans has disclosed your magnanimity and your willingness to bide your time.

Fearless, just and wise, of deep and simple faith, serene in affliction, self-restrained in success, unsuspected by any man of self-interest, you command the admiration of all men and the gratitude and loyalty of the sons of Harvard.

THE secondary schools of France are divided into grades according to the amount and quality of the work done, the support given to the school, and the attendance. The first-grade schools, known as *lycées*, have recently had their salary schedules revised, and, in true French fashion, the subdivisions are many. The teachers are divided into six classes. In the lowest or sixth class the young teacher enters upon his work, and, if in Seine or Versailles, receives a salary of 5,000 francs; if in the provinces, only 3,200 francs, the difference being based upon the cost of living. In this class he must teach two years, when he will enter the fifth class, with salary of 5,500 and 3,600 francs, according as he is in the city or in the provinces. In this class he remains three years, when he is promoted to the fourth class, with an increase of 500 francs or 400 francs respectively. Four years in the fourth makes him eligible to the third, in which he must spend five years. On entering this he receives the usual "raise" of 500 or 400 francs. In the second class another five years must be passed, with the regular increase in salary; and then after nineteen years he is eligible for promotion to the first class, where, if teaching in Seine or Versailles, he will receive 7,500 francs; if in the provinces, 5,200 francs.

SALARIES OF
TEACHERS IN THE
SECONDARY SCHOOLS
OF FRANCE.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE TEXT-BOOK IN THE STUDY OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE.

IN order to discuss this matter thoroughly, a much greater space would have to be devoted to it than this article proposes to occupy; but before giving it even a slight consideration it will be necessary to come to a definite conclusion as to the purpose for which a language is studied.

One may safely say that the serious student of today always has a very definite end in view in undertaking the higher study of a foreign language. That definite end is to be thoroughly master of something, some period, some branch, or some small number of authors. With this in view, his study should be intensive rather than extensive.

It may be objected by some that this is diametrically opposed to the good old watchword, "Lay a broad foundation and then build your fine superstructure." It will be found, however, upon close examination that no such clash occurs, for when the elements of a language have been thoroughly mastered, and an easy reading knowledge of it acquired, so far as that language is concerned, the foundation is laid, and broadly, too. All efforts made after that time are toward the superstructure. The length of time required to lay this broad and solid foundation should be, and most generally is, three years. From that point onward the pupil should begin to specialize, and to lay before himself some definite and narrow course to pursue.

It is just at this point that the text-book begins to be of particular value to the student; for now he has to read somewhat for himself, and as he is not yet in a position to be turned loose in a library, the advice and guidance of eminent specialists are of the greatest value. It is then that a firm and ever-broadening foothold should be most carefully secured, so that he may make a beginning at watching "what main currents draw the years" of the period about which his later knowledge is to center.

Now, a very pertinent question might be: Is our present and general method of throwing courses together conducive to the erection of the fine superstructure? Does it turn out students who can confidently and bravely say: "I know some three men, or even some one man; I can express an intelligent opinion on at least a few topics; I know something." Most emphatically, it does not. (Of course, this is not intended to refer to the larger universities, where each department has a large quota of well-known specialists.) What, think you, can be the definite and ready working knowledge of French writers or literature gained by the ordinary student under the guidance of the ordinary professor from such a year's work as the following: one play from Racine, one from Corneille, two from Molière, one book of fables from La Fontaine, one oration from Bossuet, one selection from Boileau, one play from Voltaire, one novel from Victor Hugo, and one from Dumas? I think all will admit that at best the knowledge will be very scrappy, and anything but thorough; nothing will be really known, nor will a sufficiently firm foothold be gained in a knowledge of any one school or movement, to incite the ordinary student to further and individual study. No, he has read ten isolated texts by the same number of authors, and has come to

look upon the year's work as something uninteresting, useless, aimless, and as a dose to be repeated under compulsion only.

Nor is the effect of this hodge-podge method of compiling courses seen upon the pupil alone; it has a similarly baneful effect upon the teacher too, be he ever so diligent and conscientious. He becomes a devourer of isolated texts. Year after year this continues until he has consumed a very great number, but unfortunately has digested very few. The result of this must certainly be that his knowledge, instead of broadening out on a well-organized basis, becomes fragmentary; he loses interest in his work, and becomes really master of no one man or period. He has not time to make the proper connections between the pieces of literature handled and the times in which they form epochs, or of which they are a mirror. In short, he becomes a text-monger, whose value is continually becoming less both to himself and to his employer.

Now, if this is the case — and I think most people will admit that there is at least more than a grain of truth in it — suggestions for improvement should be quite in order. In the earlier stages of language study — and, in fact, in most branches of education — what is well termed the "laboratory method" is principally used, *i. e.*, the student is taught to draw his own conclusions from the results of series of experiments made by himself. He is given the article or subject, or whatever it may be, to handle, and under guidance is led to analyze and reconstruct it intelligently. "*Agere sciendo et agendo scire discere*," is the motto of the day in primary work; and why should it not be in secondary? It would be a very false pedagogy that would ask the student to learn chemistry from a text-book nowadays, or to ask him to come to intelligent conclusions about, say, gases in general, if he were only allowed to test oxygen for its power of sustaining combustion, hydrogen for its specific gravity, chlorine for its affinity for oxygen, etc., etc.; and yet, as was shown above, this is the very course followed in the language laboratory.

Since, then, it is really the literature which is being studied in the period which is referred to, this inductive method will apply admirably well. Following it up, our aim should be *non multa sed multum*. But few authors should be read in one year; these should be carefully chosen from one or two schools, or movements in the same age; as many as possible of the works of each should be studied, not skimmed; and, finally, the lives of the authors should be closely coupled with the selections read, and the selections with the movement under consideration.

As the result of the present method is twofold, so would be the effect of this. The teacher would go to work with greater zest, for, having a clear and well defined aim in view, he would feel that he was gaining advancement by his own work; he would also become conscious of approaching a mastery of some few men, or of some period, which would make him more valuable to himself, more valuable to his employers, and an entity in the state.

It would naturally follow, too, that the pupil would be similarly benefited. He seeing a definite goal before him, would be incited to more diligent work; then, when he arrived at one point on the high road of learning, he could look back with a glance of satisfaction upon the road traveled and say: "I know it. Something accomplished, something done, I've earned a night's repose;" and, what is of no small value, he would be induced to make a systematic and complete collection of books, or, in other words, he would gradually build up a library complete in some degree.

If, and since, such is the case, at whose door is the blame to be laid? Is the unfortunate teacher to shoulder the burden, or is it the much-abused spirit of the age?

No, I think not. The spirit of the age is practicability—the very opposite of the course generally adopted; and the teacher is generally a conscientious, hard-working creature, willing to do the best he can with the means at hand. The great deficiency lies, it seems to me, in the modern text-book. Of course, in the present condition of society there is but little inducement for those who are really capable to spend sufficient time to turn out finished and worthy products, and, as a result, others, with various ends in view, make a hasty revision and rearrangement of a few other texts, with the result that a new edition appears containing a few new departures, but at the same time a collection of the faults of the originals.

Just as it was thought necessary to inquire, at the beginning of this paper, into the object of the study of a language, and again to notice the defects in many courses which lead away from the realization of the ideal in language study, so we might here inquire into the real purpose of the annotated text-book, and also notice the commoner defects, thereby preparing the way for the formation of an exact conception of the ideal text.

Even the texts nearest perfection are not meant to take the place of the teacher in any way. Their purpose is, by extending the sphere of influence of the great teacher, the recognized specialist, to give to the earnest teacher the result of special research, and to the honest student direction and advice in his private labors.

How do the ordinary text-books perform this duty? As a whole, very poorly. Of course, there are many noble exceptions, a few of which will be mentioned below. As a rule, however, the ordinary text-book has many faults: inaccuracies and errors are of frequent occurrence; the biographies and introductions, which are most important, are given two or three pages; little or no effort is made to give the piece of literature a place in the movement of the age; a great amount of space is occupied by notes on passages which offer little or no difficulty to the thinking student; little or no literary criticism is offered; very rarely do any philological notes appear, although these would often be most helpful to the mediocre teacher and most interesting to the pupil; and, lastly, very seldom is an effort made to publish a series of texts with a definite end in view.

It goes without saying that all of these faults do not exist in any one text-book, but there are sufficient in many to make the careful teacher dissatisfied with them. For example, the impression left upon the earnest student is very bad if, after reading the note on l. 597 of *Le Luthier de Crémone*,¹ he turns to an authentic edition of Coppée and finds that the editor is bringing forward a comparatively new theory and one which has but few advocates, viz., the application of the English "time theory" to French verse, to explain what happens to be a typographical error, as the correct reading is "Filippo" instead of "Filip." Again, in the *French Prose Composition*, by Baillot and Twight-Brugnot,² p. 76, at the end of a note on the word *oc* we find the following: "The name came from the way of pronouncing the word *oui* = *oc*," which is very inaccurate, as the word *oui* never was pronounced *oc*, but the word *oc* was used to express affirmation in the south of France, just as *oïl*, which has developed into *oui*, expressed the same idea in northern France. It is quite unnecessary to call

¹ *Le Luthier de Crémone*. By FRANÇOIS COPPÉE. Edited by B. W. WELLS. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. \$0.36.

² *French Prose Composition*. By BAILLOT AND TWIGHT-BRUGNOT. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. \$0.50.

attention to the books which err with regard to the skimmed and weak character of their introductions, lack of literary criticism, or absence of philological notes, for they are legion.

However, as was said before, all text-books are not bad, and indeed some are very excellent. A series of French text-books¹ which is being brought out by Scott, Foresman & Co., deserves particular attention. First of all, the publishers have hit upon the very good idea that isolated texts are well-nigh useless, and they are publishing a nicely arranged and well-selected series of works from the most representative authors of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. It is to be hoped that this work will be continued, and that in the near future the "Lake Series" may be conscientiously recommended to the student as a fairly representative and not too meager anthology of French literature. It is worth noting that in these texts, which include selections from Molière, Beaumarchais, Hugo, Voltaire, and Chateaubriand, very great stress is laid upon an introduction which presents in concise form (generally occupying 50 pages) the life of the author, discusses the historical importance of the movement to which he belongs, indicates his place in that movement, and makes a critical study of the play as a piece of literature. Another thing which must be said in favor of these texts is that the more important characters in the selections are generally made the subject of a short character-study, thus aiding the student very materially in an intensive study of the selections. Excellent, however, as the "Lake Series" is, it might be very much enhanced in value by the addition of occasional philological notes. One text which has introduced this feature with most beneficial results is *La Mare au Diable*.²

We have tried to show that the purpose of the study of a language is to become master of some small part of its literature, rather than to know little or nothing about a very wide range; then to show the beneficial effect which a more concentrated method would have upon both teacher and pupil, to criticise existing courses and texts in the relation they bear to the object of the study of a language, and lastly to point out what seems to us a series of texts which with a few slight emendations would leave little to be desired by either teacher or pupil.

R. J. SPROTT.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA,
Winnipeg, Man.

SOME FRENCH GRAMMARS.

IS THE instruction given in French in our schools at the present time the result of a regular growth and development, the object in view having been always the same, or would the history of this instruction be a story of experiments in methods and of a standard of attainment not clearly established? Doubtless the truth lies between the two extremes. To say that French is taught, even now, with a single purpose in view would be as far from the facts as to affirm that the manner

¹ MOLIÈRE, *Le Misanthrope, L'Avare*; by GIESE; \$0.50. BEAUMARCHAIS, *Le Barbier de Séville* and *Lettres*; by FAIRFIELD; \$0.50. HUGO, *Préface de Cromwell, Hernani*; by EFFINGER; \$0.50. VOLTAIRE, *Zaïre, Épitres*; by EGGERT; \$0.50. CHATEAUBRIAND, *Atala, René*; by BOWEN; \$0.50.

² *La Mare au Diable*, edited by LEIGH R. GREGOR. Boston: Ginn & Co.

of reaching the desired end is always the same. And yet there is greater uniformity in both manner and purpose than there has been at any time before. Various causes have worked together to produce this result, among others and most important of all, perhaps, the fact that a reading knowledge of the language is less and less held to be sufficient. Thus, whereas until recently the student who was preparing for college examinations might frequently satisfy the requirements by giving proof of the ability to translate simple French into English, he must usually now show a more intimate acquaintance with the language. Again, the demand grows constantly stronger that those who graduate from our schools shall be able to use their knowledge of the language in practical ways, to speak French or write French correctly, in social intercourse or in business. In this way public sentiment, appealed to largely by practical considerations, and the demands of the colleges are beginning to coincide with the ideals which the best teachers have kept steadily before them.

If the conditions above described are real, we should expect to find them reflected in the text-books used at the present time, and particularly in the French grammars, since the word "grammar," so used, indicates not only a formal description of the parts of speech and of constructions, but also a text-book for beginners. That this is actually the case there seems to be no doubt. A consideration of some grammars recently published, with a brief reference to one or two of earlier date, will show more clearly the nature of the development which has been taking place.

When Whitney's *French Grammar* was published, in 1887, the first step was taken, or it may be an already existing tendency was reinforced, toward that purely formal instruction in French which has done so little credit to our schools. The book was founded on Otto's *French Conversation Grammar*, first published in this country in 1864. It is difficult to see that the model was in any way improved upon, and certainly the life of the older grammar, which was an exceedingly good piece of work, was in some part lost. Sentences composed with little regard for anything but the grammatical drill they afforded made up the exercises, and the written language everywhere prevailed over the speech of daily life. Nevertheless, it was a scholarly production, worthy of the position and reputation of its distinguished author, and, in spite of its defects, it was very widely used.

A step in the same general direction, away from the study of the spoken language, was the reducing of the "first part," as it appeared in Otto's and in Whitney's grammar, to its lowest terms, the object being to present the essentials of French grammar in the simplest possible form as a step to early and rapid reading. This has nowhere been better done than in Edgren's *French Grammar*,¹ published about 1890. A short first part, containing an admirably clear and concise statement of the forms and construction of the language, with correspondingly simple exercises, is followed by a second part, equally clear in statement, in which the principles of grammar and syntax are more fully treated. The book was prepared, as stated in the preface, "with special reference to the needs of our American schools and colleges," and, the first part especially, with the purpose of enabling the pupil "to begin reading with profit at the earliest practicable moment—or in from three to six weeks." That there will always be a certain number who desire, for special reasons, to obtain a reading knowledge of French in as rapid and economical a

¹ *A Compendious French Grammar*. By A. H. EDGREN. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. \$1.12.

manner as possible is well-nigh certain. For these a better book could hardly be prepared. To such purposes, however, it is, to some extent, limited. It is probably not a book to be used to the best advantage in schools where a thorough training in French or a thorough foundation for later study, is possible.

We come now to two books, differing widely in method, but representing, each of them, the principles to which our best teachers have always held; one of them well known, and very generally used ever since its first publication in this country some ten or twelve years ago; the other more recently published, but with a position already assured—the grammars of Chardenal,¹ and Fraser and Squair.²

In Chardenal's Grammar the familiar division into two parts is practically lost. For the sake of convenience it was, and probably still is, published in England in two volumes, but the second part is a continuation of the first in quite a different sense from that to which we are accustomed in other works of the kind. Indeed, in the American edition in one volume the division is not apparent. Evidently the author has carried out his work on a different principle. In the first place, it should be noticed that there is no intention here of preparing the pupil for rapid reading. This is apparent from the fact that the irregular verbs do not appear until well beyond the second half of the book. Even then these verbs are not taken up in a body, or in such a way as to be rapidly learned, but singly and in connection with the general development of grammar and syntax. This is done, not as a matter of convenience, but because of the conviction of the author that it is the best way and the shortest in the end. "Believing," he says, "that one or two rules, given along with each verb, will keep up their interest in a most profitable way, I have inserted all the principal rules of syntax in that part of the book, and compiled exercises suited both to the verbs and to the rules." In a general way this is the principle on which the book as a whole is constructed. Scientific arrangement is subordinated to the desire to present the facts in the simplest and most attractive manner. It is in accordance with the same purpose that the sentences which accompany each lesson are numerous and as easy as it is practicable to make them. A single rule or a single new form is illustrated again and again in sentences in both languages. Thus, though it is necessary to cover something more than two hundred and fifty pages to complete the outline, the pupil who has accomplished the task has had a training in French such as cannot be obtained from the study of any other single book. An objection frequently made is that neither the American pupil nor the American teacher has the patience necessary for such work, that reading *must* be begun as early as possible in the course, because in this way only is the student's interest aroused and the rapid progress made of which he is capable. The question is an open one, though it may fairly be said that the number of those who hold this opinion is smaller than it was ten years ago, that the pendulum seems to be swinging in the other direction, and that it may be that the slower and less exhilarating way is the better.

One question remains. Is it, by any chance, possible to combine the advantages of such different systems as those represented by the two books last mentioned, Edgren's Grammar and Chardenal's Grammar? Can early reading, if it is desired

¹ *Complete French Course*. By C. A. CHARDENAL. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. \$1.

² *A French Grammar*. By H. W. FRASER AND J. SQUAIR. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. \$1.12.

by the teacher, be made possible without sacrificing the thoroughness of training which is indispensable to any real attainment? It was, apparently, with the belief that this question could be answered in the affirmative that Fraser and Squair's *French Grammar* was prepared.

Part I of this book, as stated in the preface, "consists of a series of lessons on the elements of grammar as an essential preparation for easy reading, while Part II furnishes a systematic grammar of modern French for later study and general reference." Further explanation is made as follows: The elementary exercises are based almost exclusively upon connected pieces of French, dealing with a variety of topics relating to everyday life, and make provision for both oral and written practice. They have been provided in abundance so as to admit of selection and variety, and to afford ample material for review." The plan sounds attractive, and the actual accomplishment is not less so. For this is the most modern of grammars. The chapter on pronunciation embodies all the results of the late scientific study of this subject, and the phonetic symbols of the International Association are given with each new word and each inflection which is learned. The vocabularies, which accompany the first twenty lessons, are made up of the words most likely to occur in the language of every day. The sentences, also, are meant to have a living interest. They are, in general, divided into four parts—the first for translation, the second for practice in verb forms, the third for conversation, and the fourth for written work. In this manner the first part is carried out, an outline of grammar, including the conjugation of the regular verb and the primary tenses of a few common irregular verbs, being completed in thirty-nine lessons, or about one hundred and ten pages. With the second part comes the complete table of verbs, regular and irregular, and later the details of grammar and syntax. Of this part of the book it is unnecessary to say much at present, except to note that it is complete and very clear in expression and arrangement. Finally there are some exercises to afford practice on the irregular verbs and on the principles laid down in the second part generally.

Such is the form of the book. What now of its value? Has it reconciled and united the two systems, or is it but a kind of compromise, and therefore in some measure unsatisfactory? Doubtless time alone will answer the question with authority, but it is already possible to balance the merits of the book against its failings, and so to indicate the position which it is likely to hold.

It is with the end of Part I that the first serious doubt arises. So far the execution has been admirable, though it may be noted in passing that the sentences increase in length and in difficulty somewhat too rapidly for the average pupil, and that connected prose in elementary work is too attractive not to be dangerous. In general, however, no fault is to be found with the arrangement, nor is it greatly different from that of Chardenal's Grammar. With the table of irregular verbs at the beginning of Part II, however, there is a distinct departure from the principles laid down in the latter grammar. Is the author of the older book wrong, then, when he says that the pupil who learns these verbs one after another loses interest and fails to get real benefit from the work? It is true that there are, as noted above, exercises on the forms (not really on the use of these verbs), but these afford, at best, only a kind of mental gymnastics to which the necessary life and atmosphere is quite lacking. The second part of this book is different, then, only in its details from the second part

of Edgren's Grammar. It is "for later study and general reference," and not really a continuation of Part I, which we found at once thorough and inspiring.

So the question remains unanswered. Whether or not it is possible, without increasing the size of the book beyond measure, to combine the merits of the two systems is by no means certain. The later grammar does make early reading possible, at the same time that it provides, up to a certain point, the foundation for a real knowledge of the language. It may be that beyond this point the burden can best be taken up by some other book. The text for early reading may make provision for the training which the grammar does not supply. Indeed, there are already indications that such will be the case. The important point, after all, is that the great majority of teachers are agreed as to the training which they wish their pupils to have and as to the demands which they will make of the text-books. For thoroughness of instruction Chardenal's Grammar continues to be a standard; for attractiveness and for the qualities of real life which the modern book must have Fraser and Squair's Grammar bids fair to set another standard.

JOSEPH SHERMAN FORD.

THE PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY,
Exeter, N. H.

First French Book according to the "New Method" of Teaching Modern Languages. By D. MACKAY AND F. J. CURTIS. London and New York: Whittaker & Co., 1903. Pp. xvi + 321, 8vo.

PERHAPS the term "New Method" as used on the title-page of this work is somewhat misleading, inasmuch as the absolutely new features of it are few. If the method deserves the term "new" at all, it is by reason of its novel and scientific readaptation and reorganization of the older processes and methods.

This book is an attempt to present to beginners the elements of the French language in practically the same way in which it has been so successfully taught for over a decade in German schools. It is one of the first attempts to provide English schools with a manual of the "Direct Method." We hasten to say, lest injustice be done to the authors, that in the Direct Method more than in any other the book is only one blade to the shears. It must have another to cut against, namely the teacher. The book depends for its success very largely on the teacher. It merely provides materials; the teacher is supposed to give the necessary life and interest to the instruction and recitation. The material consists of songs, riddles, very didactic anecdotes, and pictures. These latter deserve more than mere mention. While they are more elaborate than any gracing our natural method manuals of twenty years ago, they are by no means triumphs of the engraver's art. We venture to say that no house in the United States would publish so poorly illustrated a book.

For a class of little girls this would be an ideal text-book. The authors have adapted it to the need of schools in which children begin early the study of French and continue in the rudiments for several years before they undertake reading. If our schools could in like manner extend this elementary work over two years early in the curriculum, our gain would be great. It is perhaps possible that the 150 easy exercises of this book could be finished by a class in a year. Still so young a book as this would not be suited in subject-matter for a class mature enough to progress at such a rate. The great pity is that in our schools we have so few classes starting early

enough to use so charming a text, enlivened as it is by music, poetry, puzzles, and anecdotes.

The book is well organized; instruction in systematic grammar is begun early and regularly assigned through the lessons. The grammatical material provided is meager, but perhaps the authors have their reasons for that. They do not hesitate to use English in this part of the work whenever they can make learning easier for the pupil by so doing.

At the end of the book the French exercises are transcribed into the notation of the International Phonetic Society. There is an adequate series of prose exercises, though one of the authors does not approve this method of imparting a language. The vocabulary deserves special commendation. Meanings are given in English, and each word or meaning is illustrated by at least one extract from the exercises accompanied by a reference to the page and line in which it occurs.

In the introduction the authors set forth the distinctive features of the "New Method." With some rearrangement and abridgment, their statement is as follows:

Teach *living* language.

Teach speaking before composition.

Associate words and ideas directly, without the intervention of English.

Associate words and objects.

In the absence of objects use pictures; *e. g.*, colored wall charts full of action and interest.

Associate words and actions — make the teaching dramatic.

At first let the work be wholly oral, not permitting the pupil to see in writing or in print anything that he is learning.

Use arithmetical calculations as a basis for associating words and ideas.

EDWARD MANLEY.

NEW TRIER TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL.

FRENCH BOOKS PUBLISHED DURING THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 1, 1904.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Historical French Grammar. Book II: "Morphology; or, The Study of the Grammatical Forms. By ARSÈNE DARMESTETER, late Professor of the History of the French Language at the Sorbonne. Awarded the Prix Saintour by the French Academy. Edited by ERNEST MURET AND LEOPOLD SUNDRE. Authorized English edition by ALPHONSE HARTOG. Pp. 18 + 416, 12 mo. Cloth, \$0.90, *net*.

Dictionary of the French and English Languages. By W. JAMES AND A. MOLÉ. New edition, completely rewritten and greatly enlarged, by LOUIS TOLHAUSEN, former Consul General of France, Officier de la Légion d'Honneur, and GEORGE PAYN; assisted by E. HEYMANN, Officier d'Académie. Pp. 8 + 1227, 12mo. Half leather, \$1.50, *net*.

Carnet de notes d'un voyageur en France. By A. C. POIRÉ. Pp. 8 + 169, 12mo. Cloth, \$0.40, *net*.

Primary French Course: First Year. By OTTO SIEPMAN, Head of the Modern Language Department at Clifton College. Illustrated by H. M. BROCK. Pp. 14 + 229, illustrated, 12mo. Cloth, \$0.60, *net*.

Primary French Course: First Term. Lessons in Colloquial French Based on the Transcript of the Association Phonétique. A Chapter on "French Sounds and Their Phonetic Symbols." By OTTO SIEPMAN, Head of the Modern Language Department at Clifton College. Illustrated by H. M. BROCK. Pp. 6 + 82, illustrated, 12mo. Cloth, \$0.40, *net*.

Selections from Rabelais' Gargantua. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by C. H. C. WRIGHT, A.B. (Harv.). M.A. (Oxon.), Assistant Professor of French in Harvard University. Pp. 34 + 116, 12mo. Cloth, \$0.60, *net*.

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY.

Abridged French Grammar. By PROFESSOR FRASER AND PROFESSOR SQUAIR, of the University of Toronto. (This book has entirely different exercises from those in Part II of the complete Fraser and Squair, which we published two years ago.

SAINTINE'S *Picciola*. Abridged and edited with Notes and Vocabulary by PROFESSOR O. B. SUPEK, of Dickinson College.

CORNEILLE'S *Cinna*. With introduction and Notes by PROFESSOR J. E. MATZKE, of Leland Stanford Junior University.

VICTOR HUGO'S *Les Misérables*. Abridged and edited with Notes by PROFESSOR O. B. SUPER, of Dickinson College.

ABOUT'S *La mère de la marquise*. With Notes and Vocabulary by DR. M. P. BRUSH, of Johns Hopkins University.

ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN'S *Le juif polonais*. With Notes and Vocabulary by EDWARD MANLEY, of Chicago.

LOTI'S *Ramuntcho*. Abridged and edited with Notes by Mr. C. Fontaine, of the High School of Commerce, New York.

FEUILLET'S *Le Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*. With Notes and Vocabulary by PROFESSOR J. D. BRUNER, of the University of North Carolina.

CORNEILLE'S *Horace*. With Introduction and Notes by PROFESSOR J. E. MATZKE, of the Leland Stanford Junior University.

LABICHE AND DELACOUR'S *La Cagnotte*. With introduction and Notes by W. O. FARNSWORTH, of Yale University.

LONGMANS, GREEN & COMPANY.

First Facts and Sentences in French. \$0.60.

The Facts of Life. Part I: *Home Life; The School; Traveling; Plants;* \$0.80. Part II: *Animals; Town Life; Social Life and Government; Industry, etc.;* \$0.80.

Class-Room Conversations in French. \$0.80.

The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages. By FRANÇOIS GOUIN.
Translated from the French by HOWARD SWAN and VICTOR BÉTIS. \$1.75.
A First Lesson in French. By FRANÇOIS GOUIN. \$0.80.

D. APPLETON & COMPANY.

Longer French Poems. By T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

ISAAC PITMAN & SONS.

PITMAN'S *French Commercial Reader.* Commercial Letters and a Complete List of Commercial Abbreviations, and an Exhaustive Vocabulary of Different Words. Pp. 208. \$0.85.

WILLIAM R. JENKINS.

Le mariage de Gérard. By ANDRÉ THEURIET. With Explanatory Notes in English by PROFESSOR RALPH EMERSON BASSETT. 12mo. Cloth, \$0.85; paper, \$0.60.

Les aventures du dernier abencerage. By CHATEAUBRIAND. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary, by V. E. ERANÇOIS, A.M. 18mo. Paper, \$0.25.

En voyage. By T. M. CLARK. Conversations in French and English, adapted to the use of tourists and classes. 12mo. Cloth, \$0.75.

En son nom. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE. Translated by MARY PRINCE SAUVEUR, with Preface and Notes by DR. L. SAUVEUR. 12mo. Paper, \$0.60.

Divided Proverbs. An amusing and instructive game, especially for teachers and students of the English, German, French, and Spanish languages. In a box, \$0.50.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY.

An Elementary French Reader. By GASTON DOUAY, Assistant Professor of the French Language and Literature, Washington University, St. Louis. Pp. 397. \$1.

THIERS'S *La campagne de Waterloo.* Edited by OVANDO B. SUPER, Ph.D., Professor of the Romance Languages, Dickinson College. Pp. 110, with map. \$0.40.

CORNEILLE'S *Le Menteur.* Edited by JACOB SEGALL, Professor of the Romance Languages, University of Maine. Pp. 180. \$0.40.

FRANCE'S *Monsieur Bergeret.* Edited by F. H. DIKE, Instructor in French, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Pp. 302. \$1.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[The notice here given does not preclude the publishing of a comprehensive review of any of these books.]

Longmans's School Geography. By GEORGE G. CHISHOLM and C. H. LEETE New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 513. \$1.50.

Presumably a collection of maps is to accompany this book, as there are none in it. The information given is of the very general sort which enables one to learn

something about almost every land without really becoming well acquainted with any one. The authors frequently show that they have not traveled much in the countries described—a too prevalent error in our writers of geographies.

Introduction to Classical Greek Literature. By WILLIAM CRANSTON LAWTON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 367. \$1.20.

This work seem to lack the virtue of a useful handbook and not to measure up to the standard of an interesting literary production. We are surprised that in the introduction there is no mention of Mr. Fowler's book in the "Twentieth Century Series" or Mr. Capps's *From Homer to Theocritus*.

Commercial Geography. By JACQUES W. REDWAY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 406. \$1.25.

This is a very interesting book, up to date, with excellent illustrations and maps. It might almost be a supplementary reader, the content is so interesting; and herein lies the danger in its use as a text-book. The ordinary teacher—of whom there are many—may be content with what is here recorded, whereas these chapters are but suggestions, with just enough content to stimulate interest and to offer a good foundation of facts.

Money, Banking, and Finance. By ALBERT S. BOLLES. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 336. \$1.25.

This book is designed especially for text-book purposes in a commercial high school, but inasmuch as it is a brief, practical treatise on the theory of money, and the practice and usages of banking, it will be a useful book in any high school, and is just the class of book that ought to be in the reference library.

Our Government. By J. A. JAMES AND A. H. SANFORD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 271. \$0.75.

This is a distinctly useful book, and may be used with profit in the last year of the high-school course. This particular time seems best, that the full value of the book may be appreciated and the excellent references to periodicals, etc., may be used.

History of Coinage and Currency in the United States. By A. B. HEPBURN. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 666. \$2.

The teachers of history as well as the teachers of economics in our high schools should have this book, and it should be in the reference library of the school. It deals with a subject too little understood, yet everywhere discussed, and, as the author says, the "contest for sound money" is a perennial subject.

Geographic Influences in American History. By A. P. BRIGHAM. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 366. \$1.25.

This is a successful attempt to combine the materials of history and geography so as to show their interrelations. The arrangement is mainly geographical; the illustrations and maps are excellent supplements to the interesting content.

Physiology for Beginners. By W. M. COLEMAN. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 181. \$0.90.

This book is intended for the "intermediate and lower grammar grades"—a curious way of mixing up our educational nomenclature. It purports to "inculcate practical truths concerning health," and though in many respects the work is well done,

yet the profusion of illustrations in a book on physiology for children is not to be commended. The illustration on p. 42 of the little girl using a tape measure before a mirror to find her chest expansion is much more interesting than the illustration on the opposite page of the lungs and heart in all their internal hideousness. The practical nature of the book is illustrated on p. 58, where "father" is shown with one hand in his pocket, while with the other he is trying to adjust his suspenders which have no pulley—a serious error according to this book. More hygiene and less physiology as such is what our elementary grades need.

The Elements of Physiology. By W. M. COLEMAN. Pp. 364. \$0.90.

This is a text-book for use in high schools where physiology is taught as a science. The book is profusely illustrated, including colored plates and manikin.

The Teacher's Guide to Elementary Physical Geography. By W. M. DAVIS. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 80. \$0.30.

Professor Davis has written two books on this subject, and has had the advantage of ascertaining the difficulties that perplex the teacher who endeavors to handle this comparatively new subject in our schools. That their work may be helped and made more significant, he has issued this little handbook, based upon the questions that have been raised by the teachers at work.

The Ship of State. By "Those at the Helm." Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 264.

The title of the book and the generalization of the authors attract one to this book. The men at the helm are President Roosevelt, who writes of the Presidency; Senator Lodge, of the senator; the late Thomas B. Reed, of the congressman; Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Court; and so in eight additional chapters various aspects of our national government are treated of by experts. These articles appeared first in the *Youth's Companion*, and in this book form ought to be particularly useful as supplementary reading.

Organic Chemistry. By W. A. NOYES. New York: Henry Holt & Co. Pp. 534.

The author states that the radical departure in this book from the method of treatment in general use, consists in the dropping of the division into "fatty" and "aromatic," compounds and in the adoption of what appears a more fundamental and logical classification.

American History and its Geographic Conditions. By ELLEN CHURCHILL SEMPLE. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 406. \$3.

The opening sentence of this work gives the topic and suggests the possibilities: "The most important geographical fact in the past history of the United States has been their location on the Atlantic opposite Europe; and the most important geographical fact in lending a distinctive character to their future history will probably be their location on the Pacific opposite Asia." Then through nineteen chapters Miss Semple takes us over this country and blends in a wonderfully interesting manner geography and history, showing the interdependence and causal relations. Such chapters as the geographical distribution of immigration, of cities and industries, and of railroads are particularly interesting.

The Educational Theory of Immanuel Kant. Translated and edited by EDWARD F. BUCHNER. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Pp. 309.

We are under a decided obligation to Mr. Buchner for this work, in which he has brought together just what has been needed to fill a gap in the history of education. Kant's philosophy has so overshadowed his pedagogy that many have forgotten, if ever they knew, that he lectured upon the latter subject. The introduction sets forth the nature and difficulties of the task, and is a clear presentation that prepares the reader to enjoy the book. This is a real contribution to education.

New Physical Geography. By RALPH S. TARR. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 457. \$1.

The main difference between this book and the author's other books now in use and relating to the same subject, lies in the introduction of a much fuller treatment of life in its relation to the land, air, and ocean, the human interest of each topic being emphasized. The book is richly illustrated with legitimate and significant half tones of photographs.

A Synoptic Text-Book of Zoölogy for Colleges and Schools. By ARTHUR W. WEYSSE. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 545. \$4.

The author has tried to incorporate in this work such facts as are adapted to American college students or high-school students in their final years. The opening chapters deal with the more important general principles underlying the biological sciences. Zoölogy is defined, the phenomena of living matter are treated of, the relation of the protoplasm to the cell, the cell to the tissue, the tissue to the organ, and the organ to the individual; and then are given the fundamental principles of zoölogical classification. The second part is devoted to a description of the various animal types, while the third part deals with the general principles of zoölogy.

A Modern School. By PAUL H. HAANUS. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 306. \$1.25.

One could hardly call this a sequel to *Educational Aims and Educational Values*, and yet the inclination to do so is strong, for in every chapter one harks back to the positions taken by the author in his previous book and the development of the practical ideas there advanced makes very interesting reading. We hope to publish a review of this book, but wish to mention now the chapters on "Obstacles to Educational Progress" and "Education as a University Study" as having a special interest and significance.

NOTES.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CONVENTION, ST. LOUIS, JUNE 27—JULY 1.

THE World's Fair grounds are to be the meeting-place of the educational hosts this year—not in the city, but right on the grounds, in close proximity to the exhibits. There will not be the usual N. E. A. rate, nor will it be possible to provide for the including of the membership fee in the purchase price of the ticket. The special exposition rates will be used, which are generally of three classes: season tickets, sixty-day tickets, and fifteen-day tickets. The committee has made arrangements for special rates at hotels, but this applies only to those who present the N. E. A. membership certificate. The headquarters hotel is called "The Inside Inn" and is on the grounds. This hotel contains 2,500 rooms. Other hotels near the grounds will be listed by the committee, and any information concerning hotel accommodations may be addressed to W. A. Carpenter, Board of Education Rooms, St. Louis. Everybody can be taken care of. The local reception committee will meet all trains. There will be an exposition post-office on the grounds, to which all N. E. A. guests should have their mail directed.

SPECIAL CONCESSION ON ADMISSIONS.

In order to aid the plans of the Association and to facilitate the studies of the exhibits to follow the convention meetings, the authorities of the exposition and of the Association have made an arrangement whereby membership in the Association and an admission coupon ticket providing for ten admissions to the exposition, to be used within fifteen days of the date stamp on same, may be purchased for \$5—the regular price of the admissions alone.

Since the main Bureau of Registration will be located within the grounds at the Town hall, in the "Model Street," it is further provided that these special admission coupons may be sold in advance with the N. E. A. membership certificate through the office of the Secretary of the Association—or such representatives as he may appoint.

It is provided that the first admission coupon (but no others) will be good for admission without signature or date stamp, in order to enable the holder of an advance coupon ticket to use one coupon for the first admission. The ticket should then be presented at the Registration Bureau, with the corresponding membership certificate, that it may be signed and dated before the second coupon is used. This is important, since the gatekeepers will be

instructed to take up any ticket presented the second time without date stamp and signature.

These admission coupons may be secured in advance at any time between April 25 and June 20 by remitting to Irwin Shepard, Secretary N. E. A., Winona, Minn., five dollars (\$5) by Draft, Express, or Postal Money Order, for which an N. E. A. membership certificate for the St. Louis meeting and a ten-admission coupon ticket will be sent in return.

These special N. E. A. ten-coupon admission tickets are non-transferable, but if the advance purchaser is unable through sickness to attend the convention, it may be returned, with a physician's certificate of disability, to Secretary Shepard any time before July 1, and its full value will be refunded. No refund of N. E. A. membership will be made, since its value will be returned in a copy of the annual volume.

On or after June 25, but not later than June 30, these ten-admission coupon tickets may be purchased at the time of membership registration in St. Louis.

Any holder of an N. E. A. membership certificate (St. Louis meeting), either active or associate, on which an N. E. A. admission coupon ticket has not been issued, may purchase the latter on application and presentation of the membership certificate at the Registration Bureau in St. Louis, either at Music Hall (down town) or at the Town Hall, on the grounds, on the terms mentioned above, receiving full credit for the membership certificate—but in no case may two admission coupon tickets be issued on one membership certificate.

THE GENERAL PLAN.

The plans for the Association cover at least twelve days' attendance at the exposition (ten days exclusive of Sundays). The first five days will be devoted mainly to the general and department meetings, the programs of which are planned to bear upon the educational exhibits and their lessons, in order that the studies of the exhibits during the following days may be rendered most profitable. To this end all meetings will be held on the exposition grounds, in close proximity to the exhibits, where leisure between the meetings may be profitably spent without loss of time or strength.

The second week will be devoted to the study of the educational and other exhibits, during which time especial attention will be given to N. E. A. members by those in charge of the exhibits aided by assistants who will be in attendance for that purpose.

For these reasons it is believed that all teachers will wish to spend at least ten days on the exposition grounds.

It is therefore recommended that all who attend the convention purchase railway tickets which will allow at least twelve days (including Sundays) in St. Louis; this will be the fifteen-day ticket, as described below.

NOTES

THE PROGRAM.

The general sessions will be held in Festival Hall, and on Tuesday, June 28, at 9:30 A. M., the usual addresses of welcome and responses will be given which open the convention. The address of the president, Mr. John W. Cook, and an address by President James, of Northwestern University, on "The Place of the Church in American Education," will follow. On Wednesday morning Education at home and abroad will be discussed by O. J. Kern, J. H. Phillips, E. B. Bryan, and Z. X. Snyder; in the evening at 5:45, by J. J. Sheppard, S. M. Lindsay, and Booker T. Washington. On Friday, President Gates, of Pomona College, Miss Haley, of Chicago, and Mr. Aaron Gove will be the speakers. A very pleasant innovation will be the Vesper meeting from 5:45 to 6:30 each day, for which specially interesting and suitable programs have been prepared.

The National Council will hear of the Swedish and Japanese exhibits on Monday, and President Finley will tell of the progress of the year on Wednesday. Thursday will be given up to necrology.

The Kindergarten Department and Elementary Education Department will hold a joint session on Tuesday in which the kindergarten and elementary instruction abroad will be discussed. On Friday they meet separately and discuss their own particular problems.

The Departments of Secondary Education and Higher Education are the ones in which most of our readers are interested. The following is the program:

Heath's Modern Language Series

BOOKS FOR BEGINNERS IN FRENCH

Bouvet's Exercises in French Syntax and Composition,	\$0.75
By MISS J. M. BOUVET, South Division High School, Chicago	
Edgren's Compendious French Grammar	1.12
By A. H. EDGREN, formerly Professor of Romance Languages, University of Nebraska	
Fontaine's Livre de Lecture et de Conversation	.90
By C. Fontaine, Chairman of the French Department, High School of Commerce, New York City	
Fraser and Squair's French Grammar	1.12
" " Abridged French Grammar	1.10
" " Elementary French Grammar	.90
By PROFESSOR W. H. FRASER and PROFESSOR J. SQUAIR, University of Toronto	
Grandgent's Essentials of French Grammar	1.00
" Short French Grammar	.60
" Selections for French Composition	.50
" Materials for French Composition,	each 1.12
By C. H. GRANDGENT, Professor of Romance Languages, Harvard University	
Snow and Lebon's Easy French	.60
By W. B. SNOW and C. P. LEBON, Instructors in the English High School, Boston	
Super's French Reader	.70
By O. B. SUPER, Professor of Modern Languages, Dickinson College	

For over 350 Modern Language texts, see our special catalogue, sent on request

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers, Boston, New York, Chicago, London

3

5

2

0

City

2

0

0

0

0

0

2

0

60

70

lon